

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE NUCLEAR THREAT

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the debate on the nuclear weapons freeze continues. Many of the arguments are becoming well known. I believe, however, that the following interview will shed some new light on the subject. In a recent interview published in "Common Cause," Admiral Noel Gayler, who has become an outspoken opponent of an increased military build-up, and a supporter of arms reduction, lets us know his view on the issues we are facing.

As the former commander and chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific, and the former Director of the National Security Agency, as well as the deputy director of the Strategic Target Planning Staff of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Gayler brings expert insight into the debate. I think his comments deserve close attention.

(FROM COMMON CAUSE, AUGUST 1982)

THE NUCLEAR THREAT: CUTTING THROUGH THE TOUGH TALK

(In the following interview, retired Admiral Noel Gayler answers some of the complex and puzzling questions frequently asked about nuclear arms control. He concludes that now is the time for the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate bilateral arms reduction treaties.

(Gayler is former commander in chief of United States forces in the Pacific (1972-76) and former director of the National Security Agency (1969-72). He is also the former deputy director of the Strategic Target Planning Staff of the Joint Chiefs.)

Are you really worried about the possibility of a nuclear war?

Yes, I think it's reason for grave concern. I don't think it's likely, but it certainly is not impossible. There are very practical ways to cut back on the possibility of nuclear war, and we should lose no time adopting them.

What are some of those ways?

The first thing I think we have to do is to stop trying to convince the Soviets and get the Soviets to stop trying to convince us that we or they really might contemplate nuclear war under some circumstances. We need to have a statement on the part of both that they do not contemplate nuclear war under any circumstances. A statement like that would be very important. I also think we should put an end to the intemperate and threatening rhetoric between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

I have two observations about that argument, which you often hear. One is that it betrays a complete lack of understanding of the nature of nuclear weapons and, as a matter of fact, of the nature of war.

Your expression about keeping the Russians in line—well, to risk nuclear war in any

way in order to keep the Russians in line about such things as the integrity of Europe, for example, is just a complete confusion of ways and means. Europe can be defended without resort to nuclear weapons. This is not a statement of "better Red than dead." It's a statement that we need be neither Red nor dead. Furthermore, I think it's a very dangerous doctrine to keep the Russians uncertain, because if we do, the Russians are going to keep the Americans uncertain. Neither one of our societies understands the other very well. I've been shocked at the misperceptions that professional Russian observers have about the United States. And I think the same is probably true of our total understanding of Russia. So the notion that we're going to keep each other guessing is an extraordinarily dangerous idea, because they might guess the wrong thing. They might believe we were going to strike them, and feel the need to strike us first.

President Reagan says that we have to continue the arms buildup because we have a "window of vulnerability." Do you agree?

No. Taking the nuclear forces as a whole, there is no "window of vulnerability." There's no window of vulnerability because there's no vulnerability when it comes to our bomber forces and our submarine forces (which could not be easily destroyed). And it's quite dubious, I think, that even the fixed land-based missiles are as much at risk as people suggest. It would be suicide for the Russians to attempt to use a preemptive strike.

I don't think that the Russians are ahead of us. We have more of some things; they have more of others. I think it's interesting that if you ask senior military people in office if they would trade our own armed forces for the Russians', they would decline to do so.

The important thing to remember is that we now both have thousands of nuclear weapons, so there's nothing realistic even about the idea of being ahead or behind, for example, when he's got 6,000 and you've got 9,000 and it takes only 400 megatons to destroy a country. In point of fact, it makes more difference what the targeting policy is; it makes more difference what the fusing policy is, whether they choose to blow up at ground level and create fallout. It even makes more difference which way the wind is blowing, carrying fallout on a given day, than an extra thousand missiles on either side.

Then why do we continue to hear that the United States is behind?

You're in the public affairs business. You tell me why people can't see simple truths. The idea of strategic nuclear superiority and inferiority at these force levels simply has no meaning.

What is the mutual assured destruction (MAD) theory? Does it have any relevance?

It sure does. Mutual assured destruction is the idea that neither side will dare start a nuclear war because it knows that if it does, it will get it in return. That requires that a sufficient amount of the nuclear forces on either side be relatively or totally invulnerable to a first strike from the other side. We're both in that position now, and as far as I can see we will be indefinitely. The at-

tempt to attain nuclear superiority is an illusion. There is no such thing.

Is a first strike capability important?

A first strike capability is an illusion. It's generally used to refer to the idea that an adversary will strike the nuclear forces of the other country and keep it from attacking back. The fact is that it's impossible. First, it's impossible because the submarine forces of either side can't be effectively attacked. Second, it's impossible because not all of the bomber forces of either side can be effectively attacked. But this illusion is extremely dangerous.

Many people are worried about negotiating with the Russians because they feel we just can't trust the Russians. That seems to be a major concern of many Americans.

Let's see why. Because the Russians might cheat? All right, what if they cheated? Suppose they cheated by a thousand weapons. It wouldn't make any difference, but we would be very likely to know it. If they cheated by 10,000 weapons, we would be certain to know it.

Isn't it important to have nuclear weapons as a deterrent against other war?

I can't prove it, but in my opinion, it's certainly not true that nuclear arms have prevented war. As a matter of fact, we've had major wars all over the place and are continuing to have them right now. There has not been war in Central Europe, in my judgment, because the U.S.S.R. has correctly estimated that the potential gains are not worth the risk.

But you could still argue that nuclear weapons have served as a deterrent in Europe, for example.

I understand the argument. I'm telling you that I don't think it has any validity because nuclear weapons can't be used by us in any sensible way, and they can't be used by the Russians in any sensible way.

But since they can't be used in a sensible way, doesn't that mean they've served as a deterrent?

They don't serve as a deterrent to conventional war and they haven't. We remember Korea and Vietnam. There's a conventional war going on in Lebanon, Iran, Iraq. There's a conventional war still going on in Afghanistan. We just finished one in the Falklands. What good did their nuclear weapons do the British there? They did not prevent the U.S.S.R. from taking over Czechoslovakia by armed force, from taking over Hungary by armed force, from abolishing the Baltic states, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, doing all of those things.

How do you think a nuclear war might start? Would it most likely be an accident?

I don't think an accident is as likely as a misguided attempt to use nuclear weapons in some limited way, with the exchanges escalating to a total nuclear exchange. I think that's the most dangerous possibility. Another quite dangerous possibility is the temptation to use nuclear weapons by some third country, perhaps in the Middle East. There are some pretty unstable figures out there. And we could be drawn into it.

For example, if there's a nuclear explosion in Leningrad, you could understand how the Russians might think we did it, but we might have had nothing to do with it.

I don't think the deliberate massive attack by Russia against the United States is something to worry about very much because I think it would be insane on their part. But these other things are things to worry about. And unfortunately, neither we nor the Russians have much credibility in inducing other countries to forego nuclear weapons because we're not foregoing them ourselves. In fact, we're not even doing anything very serious about reducing them.

We keep hearing talk about "a limited nuclear war." Is such a thing possible today? We had one in Nagasaki and Hiroshima, of course.

That was because there was only one nuclear power. Now there are two major nuclear powers, and a number of others. And the two major nuclear powers have roughly equivalent forces. It's a totally different situation.

The reason I don't think there could be a limited nuclear war is because any nuclear initiative will have a reply. And the reply will be bigger than the initiative. That's the way doctrine is on both sides, and that's the way people are. And so it's only a question of how many steps up the ladder of escalation before you have the total holocaust.

What do you think about civil defense plans?

I think that civil defense for the purpose of disaster relief in the case of earthquake, flood, fires and so forth is a very valuable thing, but I think that the proposed civil defense program which is directed toward allegedly reducing the impact of nuclear war is totally impractical and will not work. It is bad because it tends to create the illusion that somehow or other nuclear war isn't so bad. That illusion is a very dangerous thing.

Do you think it's possible we could survive a nuclear war?

It depends on what you mean by "survive." I think that depending on a lot of things, that some Americans might still be living after a nuclear exchange if they live in some place well away from targets and they don't get caught in the heaviest of the fallout. But I don't think that either the United States or Russia would survive as a civilization, and I don't think that those who were left would be very happy with living anymore.

Why do we keep hearing that the Soviet Union has an elaborate civil defense plan?

Because it suits the purposes of people who want to push a civil defense plan in this country, and it also suits the purposes of people who either enjoy the illusion or wish to push the idea that the Soviets somehow or other have got a strategic advantage.

If you go to competent, intelligent Soviet sources, you find out that while they spend a lot of money on civil defense, it's pretty much a sham, just like it is here. They, too, have been the victims of wishful thinking. It's a turkey, and there's no reason why we should copy it.

You don't think, then, that they know something that we don't know about civil defense or that they've got some sort of secret weapon?

No, I don't think that.

Do you agree with those who say that building more nuclear weapons reduces our security and increases the risk of nuclear war?

Yes, I do. It increases our risk because the more weapons there are, the more terrible the consequences of a nuclear war and also the more likely that a military commander might imagine that he could use them for some purpose or other. It also increases the

chances of accidental or unauthorized use or the possibility that a weapon or two would fall into the hands of terrorists.

Do you think the MX missile is a good idea?

No, I don't think the MX missile is a good idea. I think it is a destabilizing weapons system because nobody has figured out a way yet to make it invulnerable to attack, and therefore it's in that position where officials would be tempted to use them or lose them. And it puts the Russians in the same bind—increasing the risk to us.

What about SALT II? Should we ratify SALT II?

I think that that would be a healthy first step.

Do you think the Soviets are just as scared of us as we are of them?

In the nuclear field, I think yes. I think they're very much concerned about what they regard as saber-rattling and illogical behavior, and they're worried to death about nuclear war.

How do you respond to those who say the recent concern about the nuclear arms threat is just an overreaction that has been whipped up by the media?

I find it very hard to comment on that dispassionately. I think that is so wrong-headed that it's very difficult to be temperate about it. People who talk like that have never seen a nuclear weapon explode. They've never taken the trouble to look at what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and they've never taken the trouble to analyze what would happen with nuclear weapons exploding over our cities or theirs. I just think it's a totally irresponsible, damnable position to take.

But haven't we had the same threat of a nuclear war for years?

As a matter of fact that's not true. We have not had this threat for years. In recent years the total number of nuclear weapons and the disposition among the powers has more than doubled. Even more important, the level of rhetoric since about 10 years ago and the irresponsible cracks about potential ways in which you might fight war with nuclear weapons have increased. I think we're in worse shape than we have been.

Do you think that's why people seem to be worked up over this issue now?

I think it's a very reasonable thing to be worked up over. After all, it is a situation where you're going to get slaughtered without any warning and without your consent, you and your family and everybody you know, and your civilization and everything else. It seems that it ought to be something to get your attention.

Do you support a nuclear freeze?

Yes, I do. I understand the arguments made about the imbalance resulting from a freeze; I understand the arguments about verification; I understand the arguments about the time it would take to negotiate and so forth. I think those are all manageable, and that they all pale into insignificance when compared to the importance of stopping the continuous buildup while we negotiate for deep arms reductions.

I don't think the freeze is a substitute for deep arms reductions, but I can't see how it does anything but help with the negotiating process toward them. I particularly reject the idea that we should or can build up our nuclear forces in order to gain an advantage over the Soviets before we can negotiate. I think that's nonsense. They can build up just as fast, and in my judgment, they will.

But you said before that you think we're about equal now.

That's my opinion, yes.

Can citizens make a difference on this issue?

If by citizens you mean voters, yes. And I think it's extraordinarily important that those citizens who feel strongly on this issue should become voters. At the same time I hope very much that this very sound revulsion against nuclear weapons doesn't spill over into a general antimilitary attitude.

We need to keep and improve a military capability to defend Europe by conventional means, so nobody will be tempted to use nuclear weapons. We need to keep the oceans open, because the Western alliance is an oceanic alliance. We need to be able to protect remote places in the world, such as the Middle East, for peacekeeping and because our vital interests are at stake there. These are things which we very much need. And they come together under the rubric of conventional weapons, and those are things that we need for our security and our freedom and much of the world's.

So do you think citizens should be voting for those people who want to do something about the nuclear arms buildup?

Yes, I think it is the most effective thing and, of course, sensitive political antennae will be out long before the voting even takes place. So the fact that there are citizens concerned about this and that they intend to vote will be registered by politicians, and it will result in changes in policy.

Now let me make it clear that I'm not talking about unilateral U.S. actions. I'm talking about developing the political will here and in the U.S.S.R. to reduce the probability of nuclear war.

But how can we influence what the U.S.S.R. does?

They follow us very closely, and I think they pay a great deal of attention to what they perceive our intentions and our capabilities are.

In my judgment, what it really takes is the political will on the part of the United States and the political will on the part of the U.S.S.R. to tell their negotiators, "You find the means to take this terrible peril away." With that political will, I promise you there is no security obstacle, no physical obstacle, no technical obstacle, no economic obstacle to making massive reductions in nuclear weapons. All that is the political will between the two of us.

Is that likely to happen?

I think so. I think that the present nuclear arms situation is so dangerous to the security of the United States and so dangerous to the security of Russia that logic and common sense should compel us to get together and do something about it. And in this area we and the Russians have two very strong, common interests. One is that we don't want to be blown up and the other is that we don't want nuclear weapons all over the world in the hands of Qaddafi and Khomeini and people like that.

Do you think that there's any evidence that the Soviets would be willing to put down some of their arms?

Yes, I think there's a lot of evidence—their pronouncements at the highest levels in the Soviet Union, from Brezhnev on down. They have formally, of course, agreed to nuclear arms reductions and to the negotiations of further nuclear arms reductions. So I don't think there's any reason to doubt that they're willing, if we can negotiate something that's clearly in the interests of both of us. And I think that's entirely a matter of political will. ●

**H.R. 6046—THE WRONG ANSWER
TO THE PROBLEM OF TERROR-
ISM**

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 6046, the Extradition Reform Act of 1982, if it is brought up for a vote on the floor of the House as presently written.

The objective of this bill is clear and commendable: to reform the process under which the United States, through extradition treaties with more than 90 foreign nations, attempts to combat the specter of international terrorism.

However, the mechanism embodied in H.R. 6046 is wrong. If we pass this bill as written, we would tie the hands of our courts and condone the suppression of political dissent in some of the world's most totalitarian countries.

By gutting the political exception defense to requests for extradition, we would tell political refugees seeking sanctuary in this country that our most cherished principles of freedom of expression and individual liberty do not apply to them.

By requiring our courts to jail foreign nationals solely on the basis of unsubstantiated allegations by foreign governments of violent activity, we would replace the fundamental safeguards of due process and probable cause with a system of arbitrary detention that is contrary to everything this country stands for.

H.R. 6046 also would not allow our courts to question the motives of a country seeking extradition or to attempt to determine whether the approval of a request would subject the individual involved to persecution and torture based on his political beliefs once expelled from this country.

Under this bill, the State Department—rather than the courts—would have the sole authority to determine whether an extradition request should be denied on the basis of gross violations of human rights in the country seeking extradition.

I, for one, feel very uncomfortable entrusting this determination to an agency that recently certified substantial progress in the protection of human rights and political freedom in El Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the leadership does not bring this bill up for a hurried vote as we rush toward adjournment. This is a serious matter that needs to be thoughtfully debated. If it is scheduled for floor action, I urge my colleagues to support a number of corrective amendments that will be offered.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

For more than 200 years, this country has been a shining light for freedom-loving people throughout the world. The United States was founded on the principle of political dissent and we should proceed very cautiously with any attempts to abrogate that fundamental principle.●

**THE MEDIA'S MISTAKE IN
LEBANON**

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, Bayard Rustin, president of the A. Philip Randolph Education Fund, wrote to the New York Times about the contrasting impressions of Lebanon he and a group of travelers to southern Lebanon and Israel found, and those presented by the news media.

Contrary to media reports, towns like Tyre, Sidon, and Nabatiya were not reduced to rubble; rather, they were swiftly rebuilding. Nor was the PLO's departure mourned; rather, the PLO was openly vilified by all who spoke with the group of Americans.

Mr. Rustin wrote hoping to set the record on Lebanon straight before media-inspired misconceptions of the war become rooted in our minds. If we are to understand the war properly, Mr. Rustin warns, we must take due note of the depth of and the reasons for the Lebanese hatred of the PLO. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask that this letter be placed in the RECORD at this point. Thank you.

THE MEDIA'S MISTAKE IN LEBANON

To the Editor:

I am writing in behalf of a group of disparate people, from several religious faiths and representing different constituencies, who visited Israel and Lebanon together, having returned on Aug. 23.

We spent two days in Southern Lebanon, including east Beirut, with the cooperation of the Israeli Government, which hoped that our findings would help dispel what it considered the extremely unfair and grossly inaccurate media coverage of the events in Lebanon. The discussions among ourselves, both there and on our return, indicated remarkable agreement and a feeling that at least some of our findings should be made known as soon as possible.

First, we agree that the coverage of Israel's military advance into Lebanon was inaccurate and unfair and did not depict what actually happened.

Among other cities, we visited Tyre, Sidon and Nabatiya, which had been reported as virtually destroyed. We found them vital, populated and thriving, with their own civilian control, and, in every way we could see, ready and capable of picking up their lives. The energy and recuperative power of the Lebanese people were striking.

Sidon was the most damaged of these three cities, but even there only isolated sections of the main street—the road to Beirut—showed heavy damage. The side streets and most of the main thoroughfare

September 16, 1982

were relatively untouched. So it was clear to us that the damage reported by the U.S. media had been grossly exaggerated.

The final, perhaps most important point we wish to convey is the widespread loathing of the Lebanese people for the P.L.O. We spoke to dozens, stopped at random on the streets. All were willing, indeed eager, to talk with Americans, and all damned the P.L.O.

The P.L.O. had seized a number of cities during its seven-year reign of terror in the area. All law there was P.L.O. law; all justice P.L.O. justice. And we heard stories of murder, rape, pillage, intimidation, sacrilege and what have you—from Maronite Christians and from Shi'a Muslims alike. One has only to visit the Christian cities of Damour or Aichiyah, or Shi'a Nabatiya, to be convinced.

Those who traveled with me were the Rev. Carl E. Flemister, executive minister of the American Baptist Churches of Metropolitan New York; Thomas Y. Hobart Jr., president of New York State United Teachers; John E. Nikas, former president of the Hellenic-American Neighborhood Action Committee, and the Most Rev. Joseph E. Sullivan, auxiliary bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn.

They have read and approved this letter and join me in urging that our media conduct intensive investigations among the Lebanese people. They will discover the depth of those people's hatred for the P.L.O., and the reasons therefore. It behooves us to pay heed.●

KEITH SEBELIUS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I wish to join my colleagues in honoring my old friend, Keith Sebelius, who died September 5, 1982. It was an honor and a privilege to serve with Keith during his 12 years in Congress. He was an outstanding Member of Congress, a true public servant, dedicated to his constituents.

Through his years of valuable service, Keith was a noted legislator in the field of agriculture. His knowledge and wisdom in the agriculture field were frequently sought out by other Members and widely respected both inside and outside of Congress.

Keith Sebelius' distinguished career in the House has left him with many friends who feel the loss of this wise and admirable man. My wife, Pat, joins me in our heartfelt condolences to his wife, Bette, and their sons, Doug and Gary.●

WHAT THE TAX BILL WAS ALL ABOUT

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, what was this tax package passed narrowly by the Congress and signed into law by the President last week all about?

We know generally what it does and who it affects. It increases Federal revenue by \$96.3 billion over 3 years, primarily by closing out excesses written into the code in passing the tax reduction a year ago. Some sacrifice is asked of each of us, but the bill most impacts high income taxpayers and corporations.

It leaves intact three-fourths of the tax deductions set into law last year, reducing their impact from \$430 billion to about \$330 billion for 1983, 1984, and 1985. Most importantly, it reduces the projected deficit for fiscal year 1983 by \$20 billion more for the next 2 years.

Finally, it carries out the revenue provisions of the budget resolution Congress adopted only last June. As for the \$38.4 of spending cuts also directed by the resolution to be made over the 3 years, some have been made already, and the remainder, the President has said, if not made by Congress, would be made by his vetoing all over-budget appropriations.

We can conclude, that the tax conference report's adoption was a signal that Congress could act responsibly—in an election year to boot—to carry out its budget resolution and take action to help reduce the deficit, cut interest rates and get unemployed Americans back to work as soon as possible.

With all this and more at stake, then, one would think that at passage the focus was on the ability of the President and the Congress to govern.

Many Republicans to the end remained adamantly opposed to any kind of revenue increase. They felt that the President was backtracking on his own ideology and that more revenues in the Federal hopper would only give the spenders both the excuse and the means to avoid scheduled budget cuts. I have to admit to much the same feelings. I did not come to Washington to increase taxes either. But, clearly, without this part of the budget resolution in place, and even higher deficits—in the \$200 billion range—facing us next spring, surely the pressure to undo the third year of the tax reductions would have been overwhelming. To protect that last 10 percent reduction, and tax indexing, I felt this measure was needed.

In the final analysis, however, for most of the 103 Republicans who, however reluctantly, supported the

bill, it was the question of governing—of providing leadership and direction for our country—that pulled their votes in.

This President was elected in November 1980 to deal with an economic mess 20 years in the making. Last year, under his leadership, we put in place new policies to curb the rate of increase in government spending, reduce the burden of taxes, encourage savings and investment, and cut back excessive Government regulation of the economy.

This year, to gain further spending cuts, protect the tax reductions already enacted, and send a good signal to the economy by reducing projected deficits, the President determined that the tax package was necessary.

What does this mean in the Congress? Though the Democrats still control the House of Representatives, the Republicans are perceived as the party of power today in Washington. Republicans can no longer sit on the sidelines engaging in theoretical discussions of how it might be when their policies are put in place. They are no longer the minority. They now must govern dealing with the world as it is, pulling together the majorities needed to accomplish direction, and in some cases, compromising in the short term to preserve and assure that they ultimately reach their goals.

The change in mind-set from loyally opposing to governing is not easy. By its very nature, your ideology gets compromised to some degree when you try to reach a consensus. But, governing in a free Republic such as ours has never shown a history of philisophic purity, and never will. We move forward haltingly, gaining direction by pulling together for short times, groups of basically divergent ideologies.

This explains much of what this tax package is all about.●

KEITH SEBELIUS: ABLE, EFFECTIVE

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1982

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal loss that I rise today to join my many colleagues in honoring former Congressman Keith Sebelius who so ably represented the First District of Kansas for 12 years.

Keith Sebelius and I shared two major legislative interests, in agriculture and energy, as well as many personal interests during the years when we served together in this House.

His commitment to a sound and workable agricultural policy will probably be the intellectual monument for

which he is best remembered both by his colleagues and the tremendous agricultural district he represented.

But having had the opportunity to work with him even more closely on a national energy policy, his devotion to the cause of America's energy independence will always be one of the hallmarks of my remembrance of Keith Sebelius.

Keith Sebelius will be remembered by all who had the honor of serving with him, and by those he served so well, as a wonderful, kind, thoughtful, and intellectual human being.

I commemorate his spirit even as I mourn his loss.●

AMERICANISM FOUNDATION

HON. JEAN S. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mrs. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have within the 17th District of Ohio the Americanism Foundation, an organization dedicated to promoting the importance of maintaining the basic freedom and liberty which we as a nation have long enjoyed. The Americanism Foundation impresses upon the youth of the community of Norwalk the necessity of preserving and protecting our individual freedom.

Each year the foundation holds an essay contest. This year's theme was, "The Meaning of Freedom and How To Advance It." First place winner is Susan Bohart, a junior at St. Wendelin High School in Fostoria, Ohio. Second place winner, a senior at South Central High School in Greenwich, Ohio, is Cregg Fetter. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate these students on their fine essays, and insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM AND HOW TO ADVANCE IT

(By Susan Bohart)

What is freedom? What does it mean to you? John Stuart Mill declared: "The only freedom which deserves the name, is that of pursuing our own good in our own way." I believe that real freedom is the power to act, speak, and think without the imposition of restraint, but in a way that does not deny the rights of others.

We, as a nation, should be proud that we were one of the first to include the right of freedom in our doctrines. Our nation was built by those searching for freedom. Each building block of our country was placed there to support our ideas of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our founders were setting a shining example to all those who suffered from oppression and inequality. The Declaration of Independence was of significance not only to us, but for all people because it upheld the basic rights of all men. Equality is not only necessary for liberty, it also allows man to work free of restraints and to excel in his own initiative and intelligence.

We are given many things in this world; but freedom is an especially significant gift given to us by God—one that no man has a right to take away. It gives us the right to make our own decisions about religion, politics, and many other important issues. Freedom gives us the power to be individuals.

Unbelievably, some people try to take freedom away from others. We witness this fact everytime we turn on the T.V. and watch the news: murder, kidnappings, the invasion of Poland and the Falkland Islands. Communists even base a large part of their system on restricting personal rights and liberties. As the impending threat of war looms near, we must recognize and stand up for our own principles. We believe in the self-determination of peoples and we have the right to govern ourselves as we see fit.

Awareness is not enough. It is also necessary that we act to guarantee our freedom. We all need to exercise our democratic rights as citizens by voting and taking part in our government—especially we, the youth of America. As we grow up and begin to receive more and more liberties from parents, teachers, and other adults, we must also look to the future and plan for the preservation of America's freedom.

Our constitution gives us the right to vote, speak, assemble, and worship. By using the freedom of speech, as I am doing now, and by using the power of our vote, we are, as Martin Luther King once said, "... speeding up that day when all of God's people will be able to join hands and sing together 'Free at last, free at last, thank God almighty, we are free at last!'"

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM AND HOW TO
ADVANCE IT
(By Gregg Fetter)

When one talks of freedom, a wide variety of responses will be received from different persons. If one were to converse with a former prisoner of war, his response would differ greatly from that of someone who has never helped defend his country from an aggressive force. In contrast, freedom is thought to be achieved at the completion of high school, living apart from one's parents, and free of their authority. Freedom is advanced in various ways, also. Both radical and peaceful methods have been administered in trying to advance freedom. The following is my personal view of what freedom represents, and what is necessary to achieve the most freedom obtainable.

Freedom is the ability to do just about anything one enjoys, providing it is lawful, which, in a real sense is not freedom at all because of the restrictions placed upon every person. To find freedom, one must look deeper than the ability to perform things that are pleasing to oneself. If one were to try to think of anything that represents freedom, he would find this task impossible because every action performed by a person is regulated—in some way—and is not isolated from everything else. Freedom, therefore, is something that has no links with actions that can be performed; literally, freedom is nonexistent.

How one interprets freedom is the amount one has. To illustrate this point, if a person were to move from Russia to the United States to live, he would feel he has total freedom compared to what he had. Now compare this Russian's view to one of a lifetime United States resident. The two resulting opinions of the amount of freedom offered in the United States would greatly differ—even though no difference occurs.

Both have the same amount of freedom, yet the two opinions conflict on the actual amount received. Based on this example, it can be assumed that freedom is only a state of the mind. In the United States, one is not free to do anything one wishes, one is only less restricted than is an individual from a foreign country such as Russia.

Lastly, freedom is only advanced by protecting what gives individuals their "state-of-the-mind freedom"—our country. This country is one of the few where freedom is said to exist. It offers what serves as a model to other countries. "The land of the free," so-called because of the opportunities presented, will remain this way only if people are willing to fight for the ideals it stands for. How much freedom one is willing to fight for is what will determine how much freedom one will receive.●

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1982

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend those Members who worked so diligently for passage of the Airport and Airway Systems Development Act of 1982. The act creates set-aside funding for airport noise abatement programs to insure that these important programs continue as promised by the Aviation and Noise Abatement Act of 1979. Of particular importance is the recognition the conferees have given to the value of public building soundproofing, especially for educational institutions. The Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport), operator of Boston's Logan International Airport, has done an enviable job in the area of airport noise control and seeks to do more under this new legislation.

Logan presents Massport with a host of unique challenges in noise abatement. The world's 13th busiest airport, and the major hub for a six-State region, Logan is located largely within the city of Boston with its four major runways surrounded on three sides by heavily populated neighborhoods. Quite naturally, it produces adverse environmental effects on those who live near the airport or under its flight path.

As jet traffic and Logan itself expanded during the 1960's and early 1970's, those effects often led to considerable differences between airport and community. These frequent conflicts not only failed to reduce noise, they often impeded Massport's ability to respond to the legitimate air service needs of the New England region.

This deadlock was broken in 1976, when Massport instituted active noise abatement and community relations programs. Combined with intelligent and aggressive air service marketing, these programs allowed Massport to

accomplish what had been considered impossible: A reduction in airport noise accompanied by an increase in air service. Massport's noise abatement office and public affairs staff working in conjunction with the community, the airlines, and various government agencies, particularly the Federal Aviation Administration, made this possible.

By pursuing a course of cooperation rather than confrontation, Massport has created a noise abatement program that is second to none, while providing the highest level of air service to the people and businesses of New England that use Logan International Airport.

For example, in the first 4 years of its existence, the Massport noise abatement program for Logan produced significant noise relief for over 65,000 people living near the airport. Even more dramatic, the number of people affected by noise at night—between the sleeping hours of 11 p.m. and 7 a.m.—has been cut nearly in half, 47 percent; and the affected land area has been reduced by 5 square miles. This success is due to both the Logan nighttime noise restrictions and to a decrease, 25 percent, in nighttime operations.

Paralleling this progress in noise reduction, Massport made major air service gains at Logan. During the same 4-year period, passenger traffic grew 29 percent and cargo volume increased 22 percent. Also, 18 new carriers, including 9 commuter lines, entered the Boston market, adding service to more than two dozen new U.S. cities. At the same time, annual commercial air carrier operations experienced a slight decrease, indicating more efficient use of the Boston hub, a benefit to the carriers, the community, the traveling public, and the Nation as a whole.

Aside from these overall gains in noise abatement, Massport has led the way in soundproofing for noise impacted public education facilities. In the fall of 1981, Massport received a FAA demonstration grant for the soundproofing of East Boston High School. The grant was the first of its kind and represented such an innovative approach to airport noise control that Massport received the First Aviation Environment Award issued by Administrator Helms. Massport, with the help of the FAA, hopes to carry this program to other schools located in Winthrop, Chelsea, and Revere, which are also noise impacted.

Passage of the Airport and Airway Systems Development Act will certainly aid in the enhancement of what is already an effective noise program at Massport. Again, I commend those Members who worked for the successful completion of this legislation.●

THE DEATH OF GEMAYEL

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of President-elect Bashir Gemayel of Lebanon has thrown an unexpected and immensely tragic twist in the already complex and highly volatile situation in Lebanon and the entire Middle East. Gemayel's death, along with the deaths of many high-ranking members of his party, creates a void in the political situation which can only be filled without much bloodshed if all the parties and factions in Lebanon, both Muslim and Christian, put aside their differences and work for the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty and stability.

While Gemayel's character and policies were uncertain, he at least introduced an element of hope to the war-torn land of Lebanon. The leader of the rightist Christian Phalange Party, Gemayel was thought to have been a puppet of Israel. However, when it came to the sovereign integrity of Lebanon, he did distance himself from Israel and Israeli policies, calling for the complete withdrawal of all foreign troops, Arab and non-Arab alike. At the same time he did begin to make overtures to the Muslim population of Lebanon. Described as an "iron-fisted man of law and order," Gemayel's elevation to the Presidency of Lebanon was the spark of hope that Lebanon needed: hope for an end to the foreign occupation, hope for an end to the civil war that has torn Lebanon asunder for so long now, hope for peace.

Gemayel was not a Sadat, but he was a democratically elected President, and like Sadat he carried the burden of bringing about a lasting peace for his war-weary country. It is not so much his death that threatens the hope for peace in Lebanon, as it is the manner of his death which has served only to continue the cycle of violence and hate that was just on the verge of being broken. In mourning the death of Gemayel, let us not also mourn the death of hope.

For myself, I have introduced a resolution calling upon the leaders of the parties and factions of Lebanon to put aside their differences and overcome this latest obstacle to peace. I also call upon all nations affected by this tragedy to join together and stop the senseless pursuit of conflicting policies and bring peace to Lebanon. If we can somehow achieve this end, Bashir Gemayel will not have died in vain.●

COAL SLURRY BILL NEEDS CONSUMER PROTECTIONS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the House may soon consider legislation to grant the right of eminent domain to coal slurry pipelines. I have a number of very serious concerns about this legislation, particularly about how coal slurry pipelines would affect utility rates. Some have contended coal slurry pipelines will result in reduced utility rates. I am afraid the result could instead be higher utility rates. I am also concerned about possible adverse environmental impacts of coal slurry pipelines.

To deal with these concerns, I have today inserted into the RECORD four amendments. The first three would provide important consumer protections and would help to prevent possible utility rate increases from the construction of pipelines. The last would require a comprehensive assessment of certain environmental effects—especially potential hazards of solid waste disposal—resulting from construction and operation of slurry pipelines.

AMENDMENT NO. 1—CERTIFICATE OF NEED

This amendment would require the appropriate State regulatory commission to certify to the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) that a proposed contract between a utility and a pipeline would further the interests of electric consumers, before such a contract could be entered into. This would insure that State regulatory commissions could review the effect of proposed pipeline contracts on the interests of consumers.

AMENDMENT NO. 2—CONSTRUCTION WORKS IN PROGRESS

This amendment would prevent a utility from passing on to its consumers any cost related to a coal pipeline, before the actual receipt of the coal. This would insure that consumers would not have to pay for a pipeline until they actually receive some benefit from it.

AMENDMENT NO. 3—COST CONTAINMENT AMENDMENT

This amendment would require the ICC to set a maximum allowable cost for the construction of a coal pipeline. There would be certain exceptions, such as inflation or unanticipated natural disasters.

Slurry proponents have argued against similar amendments in the past, saying you cannot prevent costs from rising through legislation. This provision deals with that criticism. The total pipeline cost could exceed the maximum set by the ICC, but the additional cost could not be passed on to pipeline customers, either through a contract or a regulated rate. Thus,

cost overruns would be at the risk of the pipeline promoters.

I have been particularly concerned that pipeline construction projects would be subject to large cost overruns. This amendment would insure that consumers would not have to pay for these overruns.

AMENDMENT NO. 4—HAZARDOUS WASTE TASK FORCE

The last amendment would require an interagency task force consisting of the Departments of Interior, Energy, Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency to study the effects of a proposed pipeline on a number of environmental factors. These include the effects of a proposed pipeline on water quality at point of discharge, the extent of and hazards of solid waste disposal, and other health and environmental effects such as effects of possible pipeline rupture and release. The task force would recommend appropriate conditions to the ICC for inclusion in the pipeline's certificate. The ICC could not grant a certificate until the task force has finished its review. This is similar to an amendment I proposed to the coal slurry bill 2 years ago which the Slurry Transport Association indicated it would support.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments would insure necessary protections for the consumer and the environment. I urge my colleagues to support them.●

VAN H. PRIEST CO.

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a retail business that has been an institution in my district for 57 years. The Van H. Priest Co., a chain of retail variety stores in north Florida and south Georgia, is closing its doors at the end of this year after being in business since 1925. The founder and president, Mr. Van Hood Priest, is retiring and I want the Members of this body to know about this friend of mine.

Van Priest was born in Levy County, Fla., where he grew up on a farm and small cattle ranch. His great grandfather, Gabriel Priest, was a member of the Florida Territorial Legislature and served as one of the first State senators after Florida gained statehood.

Mr. Priest moved to his current hometown of Madison, Fla., in 1918 to attend Florida Normal Institute. On his second day there, he met and fell in love with Rosalie Noegel. They were married a year and a half later on December 28, 1919. Van and Rosalie have

3 daughters, 9 grandchildren, and 14 great grandchildren.

The Priests are members of the First Baptist Church of Madison, where Van has been a Deacon since 1927. They have been active in church work both at the local and State level. He also served his country in World War II, as a Captain in the Army Air Force stationed in Europe.

Van became active in Florida politics in the mid-1930's. His involvement was sparked by the realization that something had to be done to combat restrictive governmental intervention in private enterprise. His career in politics and public service spanned 35 years of his life. This public service included a term in the Florida Legislature in 1940-41, and 20 years as a member of the city commission of Madison from 1945-65. For 11 of those years he served as mayor of the city.

Mr. Priest's public service is best exemplified in his participation and leadership in the various organizations that serve the retailing industry and the business community in general. His service to Florida retailers included the presidency of the Florida Chain Store Council, which was the forerunner of the Florida Retail Federation, an organization that he later served as chairman. He was also a director of the Florida Chamber of Commerce. Many national organizations have benefited from his leadership, including the American Retail Federation, the Association of General Merchandise Chains, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. His participation in these organizations has brought him to Washington to testify before several congressional committees. Van has been a successful retailer and a strong supporter of the business community.

Mr. Speaker, Van has become something of a legend as a toastmaster in civic and business organizations, due principally to his winning personality and warmth of his humor. With the House's indulgence, I would like to conclude my remarks with a few quotes from Van H. Priest that would serve all Members of this body well:

I am in this business and it has been good to me. The least I can do is work with friends and competitors alike for its progress.

A passive attitude toward government by businessmen will place us in a position of being dominated by those we elect. As a businessman, I have an obligation to myself and every other member of the community to do what I can to keep our commercial economy healthy and flourishing.●

NEED FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting today—in the series of presentations begun in the RECORD yesterday—the opening remarks made by Representative GEORGE MILLER at the forum on the New Federalism and its effect on the children of Connecticut. The eloquence of Congressman MILLER in stating the need for child and families services in this Nation was greatly appreciated by all who heard it at the forum, and I commend the following statement to all of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MILLER AT ST. JOSEPH COLLEGE, HARTFORD, CONN., SEPTEMBER 8, 1982

It is with a great deal of delight that I have come to Connecticut today. I am, of course, pleased to sit on this panel with my distinguished colleagues and friends, Toby Moffett and Barbara Kennelly. Both Toby and Barbara have recognized that the citizens of Connecticut are deeply concerned about the lives and futures of their children, and have persisted in consistently representing those concerns in the Congress. (Barbara has had less time, but is a welcome and thoughtful addition to the Connecticut delegation and to the all too few Members of Congress who have placed children, youth and families high on their agenda.)

St. Joseph College should also be commended for hosting this day's forum on the impact of New Federalism on Connecticut's children, youth and families. Connecticut is fortunate that its universities and colleges have developed strong programs in early childhood education and child development, which make the connection between the activities of front line professionals and workers in child-caring agencies—and the policies which governments at every level, and the private sector, develop and carry out.

I am greatly heartened by the numbers of people who have joined us today, including the students who are here, and hope the forum will be productive for all involved.

The subject of these hearings is especially important because, as some of you may have heard me say in the past, children are neither partisan nor are they powerful. They do not lobby Congress, they do not contribute to our campaigns, and as a result, generally they remain the victims of this administration's proposals for budget cuts and policy changes.

What outrages me is that the program cuts, the so-called New Federalism, or turn-back of programs to the States, the deregulation which this administration has proposed or in many cases already achieved—these have touched the very programs which have been most successful in turning around poverty, in getting rid of illiteracy, in providing children a chance to read and write, in bringing millions of handicapped children into the educational system with their non-handicapped peers, in ridding this country of malnutrition.

They are the programs that have been least beset by fraud, waste and abuse.

They are the programs that have begun to bring equity to black and Hispanic and other minority children, to young girls, and to disabled children.

They are the programs that have worked, by the admission of the very officials who are calling for their dismantling. According to these officials, the programs save children, save money, and are effective.

The Education Secretary admitted that title I helps disadvantaged children do better in school. But he endorses cuts of hundreds of millions from that program. He admits that Public Law 94-142 has brought an appropriate education to millions of handicapped children, yet he calls for dramatic revisions in the regulations fundamental to this program which would clearly undermine the intent of Congress, and represent a substantial retreat from the hard fought rights for handicapped children and their parents.

The Deputy Agriculture Secretary testified that WIC saves lives and produces healthier babies. But he wants to slash hundreds of millions from that program. And most recently, he has begun to prepare regulations which tamper with the high protein foods carefully identified to aid low-income pregnant women and children who have been certified to be at nutritional risk.

The official in charge of Head Start and the President have called it one of the most effective programs, and yet have endorsed major cuts and regulatory changes.

It strains the imagination to believe that they, or the administration they represent, want to cut these programs to make them work better. I would be delighted if someone who testifies today could tell me that any of the changes that have occurred so far have been beneficial to the children and families affected. I have not heard this yet in my community, nor in the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member.

Now Connecticut is a small State, certainly compared to my home State of California, and Connecticut is known for its relative affluence. But let this not mask the needs of the 26 percent of its population who are its children:

More than 12 percent of these children live in poverty.

More than half of the mothers in Connecticut are in the labor force, including 42 percent of those with children under 5 and more than two-thirds of those with school-age children.

27 percent of the female-headed families in Connecticut lived below the poverty line in 1979; over 60 percent of those families with children under 6 lived in poverty.

Connecticut's black population is small—only 7 percent of the State's citizens—but its children are exceedingly vulnerable:

Nearly 30 percent of all blacks lived in poverty;

A black child in Connecticut is almost four times as likely as a white child to be classified mentally retarded for school purposes;

A black child in Connecticut is twice as likely as a white child to be suspended or expelled from public school.

Infant mortality and low birthweight seem to be significant problems in this State:

In 1980, 1 in 98 infants in Connecticut died;

In 1978, 1 in 43 black infants in Connecticut died;

Over 1 in 14 babies born in Connecticut is low birthweight;

20 percent of the births in Connecticut in 1977 were to women who had not completed high school;

Hartford alone has the highest teenage pregnancy rate, and the largest number of infants born to teenagers; Hartford's infant mortality rate is almost twice that of the State.

Surely it is tragic for a government to know of the great needs of its people, but be unable to aid them.

But it is far more tragic for a government to possess the ability to relieve the suffering of its people, and yet to turn away, or to single them out as frauds and loafers.

Last year alone, Connecticut lost \$3.5 million in Federal funds which it uses to provide breakfasts and lunches for thousands of schoolchildren, clinics for maternal and child health care, teachers and aides for educationally disadvantaged children who need special help, training and work opportunities for unemployed teenagers and adults alike.

This administration would have you believe that the private sector can fill this gap. There is no question that neither this Nation, nor this State could deliver needed services to its residents without the aid of the private sector.

But there is also no denying that private family and child-serving agencies, churches, and others have been making a substantial contribution to the welfare of this Nation for years. We can all do more, and we should all do more.

Yet, even if corporate America, much of which is headquartered in Hartford and has contributed substantially to the life of this city, doubled or tripled its efforts in the next years, it would only touch a fraction of what has been cut from the Federal budget for child and family services.

No; in my view, budget cutting does not equal a policy; deregulation does not equal a policy; turning programs back to State and local governments does not equal a policy. These are just code words for those who argue, with considerable popular support, that government can do nothing to remedy the problems because government, itself, is the problem.

I reject that rhetorical and narrow view and so must you.

We are here today to learn from active and knowledgeable people in this State just how Federal policies in the past year or two—policies which represent a radical departure from the past several decades—have affected the children, youth and families in this State.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLINT ROBERTS

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, weather conditions in South Dakota caused a flight delay which prevented me from being here to vote on several measures during yesterday's session.

Had I been here, I would have voted as follows: "Yea" on rollcall No. 321, the Shipping Act of 1982; "yea" on rollcall No. 322, the Patent Term Restoration Act; "nay" on rollcall No. 323, the Federal Boat Safety Act amend-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ments; "nay" on rollcall No. 324, the Sailing School Vessels Act of 1982; "nay" on rollcall No. 325, technical corrections in health laws.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during the session last evening. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 331, the Walgren amendment to H.R. 6956, and "yea" on rollcall No. 332 on final passage of H.R. 6956.●

NOTES ON THE MEXICAN CRISIS

HON. JIM JEFFRIES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, in presenting the following material, I must respect the desire for anonymity of those Latin American neighbors who have brought to my attention an analysis of recent political, economic, and social trends in their country. Many live in countries in which it is unwise to be overly critical of the left.

Therefore, let the following stand on its merits. It is the position of many Latin Americans that the past two presidential administrations in Mexico, covering the 12-year period since 1970, have seen a deliberate change in the direction of political affairs from that which prevailed under President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz. It is their contention that both President Luis Echeverria and his hand-picked successor, President Jose Lopez Portillo, have conducted a deliberate campaign of renewed radical socialism within Mexico, and collaboration with the forces of communism in their conduct of foreign affairs.

While the following open letter may be difficult reading for those unfamiliar with Mexican affairs, I do believe that this information will reward your attention. Surely all of us are aware that Mexico's problems affect the United States in strong and complex ways.

The open letter follows:

MEMORANDUM: THE FINANCIAL AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN MEXICO

It would be a grave error if the current crisis in Mexico should be considered merely an economic phenomenon expressed by the devaluation of the Mexican currency in relation to the U.S. dollar, because of the serious difficulties in the payment of its financial compromises which were acquired in order to promote its development.

To explain the recent nationalization of private banking only as a method of controlling an extremely critical economic situation is to be guilty of ingenuity and superficial reasoning. Viewed seriously, as it must be, it is seen as a definite process, predetermined and well-planned, which will bring about the gradual socialization of Mexico in order to lead it to Communism. The President himself recognized as much in his last message to the nation when he reaffirmed that, "The revolution has lost its fears and

has retaken its revolutionary course." "Today we nationalize the banks", he announced, "and we will continue to move forward with other measures".

The stage has been set, the actions of the Mexican government in the last twelve years have confirmed it and now, waiting in the wings are other entities of the private sector waiting to be nationalized, the announcement of which will be given at the propitious moment in a somewhat veiled form in order for these latest actions to be accepted in Mexico and not rejected by that zone of influence which we call the West or free world, and certainly not by the U.S.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

In 1970, at the end of the term of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the external debt of Mexico was \$3.6 billion. During the following twelve years, under Presidents Luis Echeverria and Jose Lopez Portillo, Mexico's national debt has risen to about \$80 billion.

At the same time, because of the oil boom beginning for Mexico in 1975, a total of about \$70 billion in oil revenues became available to the Echeverria and Lopez Portillo administrations. Thus, there has been a tremendous inflow of capital directly into the hands of the Mexican government.

Consider that the internal needs of Mexico were always more or less covered by the internal income of the nation. The question then becomes, what has the government of Mexico done with \$150 billion in foreign capital? And how is it possible that the international bankers should fail to notice the disappearance of such an enormous sum of money until very recently?

If this money had been truly invested in Mexico, the nation should have been transformed into the most developed country in Latin America. Instead, the Mexican peso has been made nearly worthless, the country's virtual bankruptcy is known to all, and Mexico faces its worst crisis in many decades.

There can be no doubt that the Communist Mafia within the government of Mexico, which has developed such power during the past two administrations, has put enormous sums of money to its own uses. In effect, this money has been stolen from the Mexican people.

We must note these additional facts:

1. That the peso has decreased in value from 12.50 per dollar to a current official rate of 70 per dollar. The "free market" rate is, in fact, less than one cent per peso.

2. That this tremendous devaluation has made it at least five times more difficult for Mexico to repay its debt, even at the official rate.

3. That Mexico needs emergency measures for ninety days to save the situation in relation to its debts, principally its interest payments as well as to prevent further erosion of its currency. Mexico also needs more profound and far-reaching measures in order to renegotiate its external debt and to pay within a reasonable length of time, which in our judgment will not be possible unless the new government of Mexico decides on an all-encompassing global plan which can save the economy of Mexico today and in the future with its petroleum, using it adequately and without extravagant waste. Besides this, Mexico must effectively accomplish a measure of self sufficiency in its food production, take advantage of its oceans, coasts and beaches in order to stimulate tourism with international cooperation, as well as developing its mineral resources. More than

all this, however, is the need to utilize its man-power and managerial capabilities for its development because no where in this world can this be accomplished if not under the system of free enterprise, away from the false and illusory formulas of Socialism, forerunner of the implantation of totalitarian Communism.

4. That the announced measures by the Bank of Mexico have established absolute control over the current rate of exchange and led to the expropriation and nationalization of the private banks. These measures are on target and present the only possible solution, given the seriousness of the current economic crisis in Mexico. Nevertheless, these measures can never in any way justify the nationalization of the banks and their expropriation, because these could have been dictated by the Banking Commission, a dependency of the "Secretaria de Hacienda y Credito Publico" (the equivalent of the IRS) since before the crisis and within the system of free enterprise, or the system of mixed enterprise which existed. What was being done by the private banking system is the same as is being done by the officials—all directed by the government officials. That is why there is blame to be assigned, the principal offenders were the Mexican Officials, in their capacity as total guardians of the economy and finances of Mexico. The flight of private capital outside the country was a result of the alarm and lack of confidence which was generated by the government and in no way justifies the nationalization of the banks, especially since according to reliable statistics the principal looters of their own country were the Mexican government officials.

The factors which have caused this economical situation will not be discussed in detail because they fall into the sphere of public opinion and are well known to you, but to summarize:

(a) Lack of adequate planning in many official programs.

(b) Serious corruption carried to extremes not only by politicians at the highest levels but by the whole system and particularly by the Communist Mafia which has taken hold of the Mexican government and its official party, the P.R.I.

(c) The systematic nationalization of Mexican businesses and production media which has been accomplished by the government in order to enlarge what they have called the public business sector, to the detriment of the private sector. The result of this policy has been that the official administration has become highly inefficient as far as administrating and stimulating those businesses which it has acquired or expropriated, and not only does it not produce utilities in these state businesses, paralyzing the enormous resources invested therein, but instead it utilizes a very large part of the Mexican national tax base in order to cover the permanent deficit in these businesses. Of course, in these so-called parastate businesses, there exists intense corruption as well.

(d) An important part of the economic problems of Mexico is not only the unworkability of its socialist systems, but the fact that there is a real maliciousness in the upper political circles which know well that the road to Communism is made smoother by the chaos which is produced by an economic crisis.

The foregoing is a simple analysis of the economy of Mexico.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SITUATION OF MEXICO

The Mexican revolution is nationalistic in its origins and founded on an excellent doctrinal and constitutional base. It was accepted and supported by the Mexican people and has merited international respect, including of course the U.S.A. This revolution provides a mixed economic system and a just balance of individual and social guarantees. It has generated, in several of the past presidential periods, effective progress and solid principles of development.

The Mexican revolution recently has deviated from its course because it has been managed by a Communist Mafia of intellectuals who were the leaders of the teachers and students during the so-called Student Movement of 1968. This movement was intended to be a Communist take-over led by the Communists who mobilized the students of Mexico. This intent was frustrated thanks to the energy and sacrifices of then President of Mexico, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz who put down the insurrection with the help of the army.

Unfortunately, President Diaz Ordaz made the mistake of nominating as his successor, President Luis Echeverria. He was a hidden director of the same revolutionary movement of 1968 who, on assuming power as President of the Republic, began calling his leaders and directors to power, nominating them as Secretary of State, Undersecretaries and directors of numerous dependencies of the Mexican Government. The unsuccessful University rebelling of 1968, for all practical purposes did succeed by rewarding its participants with key positions in government and in the official party. This was carried out with the complicity of President Luis Echeverria.

In reality, the socialist action has kept up a constant and continuous pace since 1970. At the beginning Echeverria acted very cautiously because he was afraid of President Richard Nixon but the trend toward Communism was accelerated when the Nixon administration was attacked and nullified. The socialization was effected through a series of unconstitutional laws such as the famous "Water Law" among others, which attempted to limit to twenty hectares the maximum ownership allowed under the law. Modifications to the Constitution were also introduced in order to facilitate the Socialist trend. The official workers union, the C.T.M. was in competition with the radical Communist unions which Echeverria secretly supported. Echeverria and the Communist Mafia were not able to accomplish their goal of socialization during his term of office. Echeverria finally passed on the Presidency to his friend and classmate not only from school days but also from the same socialist sect, Licenciado Jose Lopez Portillo, who continued slowly, patiently and efficiently to implant socialist measures.

The principal exponents of the socialist Mafia of 1968 who participated in diverse activities with Echeverria and who were transferred to the government of Lopez Portillo are, among others: Porfirio Munoz Ledo, Pedro Ojeda Paulada, Jesus Reyes Heróles, Augusto Gomez Villanueva, Horacio Flores de la Peña, Carlos Tello Macias, Jorge Castaneda, Andres de Oteiza, and dozens more who are still in government and are preparing to continue on into the next administration of Miguel de la Madrid, supported by Lopez Portillo. This Mafia of course is composed of many other directors who act in the extreme left wing of the

party within the official plans of the so-called political reform which allows for other valid options within the framework of socialism and is one of the many strategies which the communist world uses.

During the last two presidential periods, the administrations of Echeverria and Lopez Portillo have brought to Mexico as immigrants or political exiles the widest range of agitators, pseudo-intellectuals and specialized guerrillas ever gathered in any country of the world. They have come from the rest of America and from all over the world, increasing the Communist danger which menaces from within and threatens also from outside the government. The risk is great not only for Mexico but for the security of the United States as well.

Of course they prefer the slow road of expropriations of different sectors of the economy and even of private property.

The political compromise felt by the last two presidents of Mexico, Echeverria and Lopez Portillo, especially the latter to collaborate with the plan of Communist aggression in the Caribbean and on the American continent is a clear and categorical compromise which he has carried out with true passion and socialist fanaticism. The intemperate cry of Lopez Portillo, "Viva Nicaragua" in his last State of the Union message and his passionate and incomprehensible defense of Nicaragua, of the guerrillas of El Salvador and even of Cuba, which culminated with the admission made by the President of Mexican investment of foreign aid to these outbreaks of Communism on American soil, help which he himself calculated at 700 million dollars (money which has borrowed at the expense of the Mexican people), speaks eloquently of the true posture of those who govern Mexico.

The explanations and diplomatic maneuvers which they accomplish in order to cover up and which produce results thanks to accomplices in the U.S. State Department or with certain "liberal" senators and representatives should be seen and judged for what they are.

This is a real tough brief explanation of the Mexican situation. One is the economical situation and the other is the social and political, and although both are interrelated, there should be no confusion. It must not be thought that the remedy will be found only in a technical-economic sense, the matter is not merely financial.

Conclusion.—If the ninety day grace period which President Lopez Portillo requested of the financial institutions and the United States is granted, he should be warned not to continue the process of nationalization which will lead this country to Communism. Simplistic and false explanations must be rejected.

It is known that the new President Miguel de la Madrid wants to remedy the situation fundamentally, but he is surrounded by the Communist Mafia which will try to tie his hands. Of course Mexico should be allowed the opportunity to cleanse itself which it needs, as well as the redirection of the labors of all Mexicans. In order to help him react and to shake off the Communist Mafia, he should carry out a clear and energetic policy for the well being of Mexico and the vital security of the United States and the free world.

Today, the principal weapon of the U.S.A. is represented by economic negotiations. If banking executives or middle management North American diplomats are permitted to manage these negotiations without supervi-

sion from the upper echelons, socialism or communism in Mexico will be reinforced.

Liberal bankers and diplomats should not be given the opportunity to solve the situations taking into account only the financial point of view, since they could help to build a political problem south of the border of incalculable gravity. They could be allied with the Communist Mafia.

Regarding Central America, we suggest ignoring the traps and subterfuges of Socialist Mexicans and liberal Americans and solving the situation of Central America fundamentally, as was outlined at the start of the Republican Administration—a policy which automatically would help to discipline the Communist Mafia in Mexico, which should be eliminated at the first opportunity.

The weaknesses in Central America have inspired Mexican Communism and the politicians which support it at the highest level of government.

The free world has relatively recently lost Cuba in favor of Communism, Viet Nam, Cambodia, part of Africa and other countries—the most recent being Nicaragua with the imminent risk of its spread throughout all of Central America.

Finally, can North America afford the luxury of tolerating Communism in Mexico? *A Group of Concerned Latin Americans.*●

TRIBUTE TO MR. LEROY COX

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join the Raytown Area Chamber of Commerce in saluting Mr. Leroy Cox, Raytown, Mo.'s, first mayor.

Mr. Cox has a long and impressive record of service to the city of Raytown. He is a lifelong member of the Raytown Historical Society, the Secotoma Club, the Saddle Club, and the American Saddle Horse Association. He is also an honorary member of the Raytown Kiwanis Club, a 50-year member of the Raytown Masonic Lodge No. 391, and a member of the Scottish Rite of Free Masonry. Mr. Cox has served as a past president of the Brooking Township Democratic Club, past president of the Congress of Democratic Clubs, chairman of the YWCA Building Fund Committee, and a board member of the Jackson County Planning Commission Board of Zoning Adjustment. He is also a member, past president, and has served on the board of directors of the Raytown area Chamber of Commerce.

Aside from his memberships in various civic organizations, Leroy Cox has also taken a great interest in the young people of his area. He sponsored the Raytown Piperettes women's AAU basketball team which has ranked fifth or above nationally for 15 years and has also served as benefactor to numerous college students through the years.

Perhaps the most memorable of Leroy Cox's accomplishments came

during his 9 years as mayor of Raytown. During that period he was instrumental in instigating sewer projects, resurfacing city streets, setting up the city police department, and installing street and traffic lights. Clearly, Mr. Cox's actions at this critical period of the formation of the city have paved the way for the city's successful operation.

The dedication and hard work of Americans like Leroy Cox have made this country what it is today. I join the citizens of Raytown, Mo., in thanking Mr. Cox for his service to his community and I want him to know how proud we are that he is a Missourian.●

EXTRADITION REFORM ACT OF 1982

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concern about certain provisions of the Extradition Reform Act of 1982. The points I will discuss were recently brought to my attention by the American Civil Liberties Union. I think there is considerable reason to reform the extradition laws in this country. However, H.R. 6046, as it now stands presents several problems. My primary objection to this piece of legislation is that the bill would prohibit a court from determining if an accused individual is being extradited for political opinions, race, religion, or nationality. Under the new law, upon the simple request of a foreign government, extradition procedures may be commenced at the mere accusation of a foreign government under an extremely loose definition of "violent activity" on the part of the accused.

Historically, our Nation has taken in political leaders who have been persecuted in their home countries by oppressive regimes. The net effect of this law would be to create a vast loophole by which these regimes can extradite their political opposition leaving these individuals with little protection in this country. As much as we have an obligation to cooperate with countries in extraditing individuals who have committed criminal acts, we must not create a situation in which the United States becomes a partner in the persecution of individuals because they may have been involved in political activity which is displeasing to the regime in power. Currently, there is a case involving the Philippines where we have been told that the Philippine Government will seek extradition of Mr. Benigno Aquino, a leading opponent of the Marcos regime who advocates peaceful opposition. Yet he has been charged

by the government with planting bombs and he will be vulnerable for extradition under the proposed law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must seek reform of the current law. However, the adoption of this bill as it now stands will result in abrogating the standard of justice which this country has maintained for so long. We must be careful that we do not provide oppressive regimes with the means to manipulate American law by making accusations which rest on flimsy charges, yet which conform to the new extradition law. Mr. Speaker, based on the information which the ACLU has now brought to my attention, I would like to see some revisions of this bill in order that the United States maintain an extradition policy which provides for an equitable and just procedure in which criminals are extradited to stand trial for their crimes, but protects political activists who are subject to persecution by a ruling regime abroad.●

BILL GREEN COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S MIDEAST PROPOSALS

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to address the sisterhood of the Brotherhood Synagogue in New York City on Sunday, September 12, on the subject of the President's proposals for bringing peace to the Mideast.

I welcome the President's initiative in reviving the stalled peace process, but have serious reservations about some of the details of his plan. My speech on Sunday appraised the President's proposal, and for the benefit of my colleagues, I would ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. Thank you.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE BILL GREEN AT THE BROTHERHOOD SYNAGOGUE

I am delighted to join you today to discuss the situation in the Mideast. Little did I know when I accepted this invitation that I would be speaking to you at such a crucial juncture, right after the PLO departure from Lebanon, and after the President's proposal for the next stage of the Camp David talks.

Despite the great attention that the President's proposals have received, they certainly are not an abrupt change in American policy. For many years, American Presidents have been discouraging Israeli settlements on the West Bank, have opposed the creation of a Palestinian state there, and have sought to involve Jordan in negotiations with Israel.

What is new is the decision of an American President to suggest a specific outcome of the negotiations called for in the Camp David plan. Though in the past it has been clear the American policy opposed annex-

ation of the West Bank by Israel, and opposed creation of a new country on the West Bank, the Camp David agreements had not precluded either as a possible outcome of the process. In that respect, the President's plan does change the bargaining process envisaged at Camp David.

Whatever one thinks of the President's proposals, and, as will be clear, I have serious concerns about these, one cannot assert that they are beyond the pale as far as Israel is concerned. Quite the contrary, the President's proposals appear to be consistent with the Allon plan, which has for some time been the Israeli Labor opposition's basic policy on the West Bank.

The Allon plan essentially proposed that Israel establish a strong military presence along the immediate West Bank of the Jordan River—a sparsely populated area—whose basic purpose would be to interdict any flow of weapons from Jordan to the West Bank. Under the Allon plan, Jordan would assume responsibility for civil governance of the balance of the West Bank. The border between Israel and the West Bank would be modified under the Allon plan so as to insure greater protection of Israel. And of course, the Allon plan assumes a united Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

As one reads the President's proposals, the Allon plan is an entirely possible outcome. Small wonder then that the Labor coalition in Israel has expressed a willingness to proceed on the basis of the President's plan.

Having said all that, I must also say that I think there are some minor but nonetheless serious omissions in the President's proposal; there are some hard issues that all parties to the negotiations must face, and, finally there is one major aspect of the problem that the President totally ignores but that must be addressed if there is to be peace in the Mideast.

My first criticism of President Reagan's statement is that it appeared to place the onus on Israel for the present status of the Camp David negotiations. That is plainly unfair and incorrect. At the moment, the Camp David peace process is not in process because the Egyptians refuse to come to the bargaining table. They have done so by stating that they will not resume the process until Israel has totally withdrawn from Lebanon, and they have done so knowing that Israel will not withdraw from Lebanon until the Syrians have also done so. Thus, Egypt has in essence given Syria the power to prevent the resumption of the Camp David process. I hope President Reagan will take due note that Syria, having been given this power by Egypt, has now rejected his plan.

My second criticism of President Reagan's proposal is its failure to acknowledge that the reason its proposed solution has not been on the table in the Camp David talks is that the Jordanians have not been at the table. For this reason, I was shocked when Secretary of Defense Weinberger suggested earlier this year that we sell weapons to Jordan: Jordan has been a consistently hostile opponent of Israel and the cause of peace in the Mideast. I was appalled by the idea of rewarding Jordan for its intransigent behavior. Though the administration has tempted the Jordanians with armaments to mitigate their hostility to peace, now it seems the President has taken a higher road, placing the diplomatic "ball" in King Hussein's "court." I am pleased the administration has realized that Jordan must be involved in the process, and has firmly challenged King Hussein to come to the table.

This is clearly preferable to past unworkable suggestions of buying stability through selling arms to the opponents of peace.

I am also puzzled by the President's omitting Lebanon from his framework for peace. I would think an Israeli-Lebanese peace treaty should be a priority on the U.S. Mideast agenda. Until all foreign troops leave Lebanon and a peace with Israel in the south is established, the potential for renewed violence and instability remains.

Now let me now step back and review the West Bank problem from both the Israeli and, as best I can, the Jordanian point of view.

From the Israeli point of view, the West Bank poses a most difficult dilemma. However, much one rectifies frontiers, the West Bank is inevitably the high ground from which modern weaponry can shoot down on the heart of Israel. So one does not have to go back to Biblical times to understand Israeli concern about the West Bank.

But demographics make annexation of the West Bank an uneasy solution for Israel. Israel proper has a total population of about 4 million, 15 percent of whom are Arab. Despite the differing birthrates of the two groups—about 4 percent for Arabs, and about 2 percent for Jews—Israel within its present boundaries and assuming continued immigration, will plainly be a predominantly Jewish state for the indefinite future. In stark contrast, in the West Bank, there are some 800,000 Arabs, and no more than 25,000 to 30,000 Jews. The birthrates for Arabs and Jews are for each group less than in Israel proper, but clearly the West Bank has a growing Arab population. In fact, if Israel absorbs the West Bank, it will go from having 15 percent of its population composed of Arabs, to having almost 30 percent of its population composed of Arabs. The problem this poses is even more acute if Israel seeks to absorb the Gaza Strip and its nearly one-half million Arabs.

Despite Jordan's past abortive effort—accepted only by Great Britain and Pakistan—to annex the West Bank, the West Bank represents very much the same demographic time bomb for King Hussein that it does for the Israelis.

Jordan, you will remember, was once Trans-Jordanian Palestine, that part of Palestine to the east of the Jordan River. After World War I, Great Britain, faced with its conflicting commitments to the Arabs and to the Jews, installed the present royal family in Jordan while equivocating on its commitment to create a Jewish National Homeland in the balance of Palestine. The Jordanian royal family imposed by Britain came from the Hashemite nomads rather than the Palestinian Arabs. Thus King Hussein has always been uncomfortable, despite the unsuccessful Jordanian effort to annex the West Bank, at the prospect of having to try to govern a country dominated by the Palestinians rather than the Hashemites. This is already a problem in Jordan, were the West Bank incorporated into Jordan, the problem would be very much aggravated.

Thus we face a situation where the Begin government in Israel appears ready to assume the demographic consequences of annexation of the West Bank, while the Labor opposition opposes such an approach as too fundamental an alteration of Israel's essential character as a Jewish state. King Hussein, too, faces a demographic bind as well. Clearly, negotiating the West Bank's status involves some very harsh realities for both sides of the negotiations, and promises some protracted difficulties.

In light of what the President's proposal may hold for either Israel or Jordan, I want to conclude by pointing out that gravest problem of the President's plan is not how it proposes to deal with the West Bank, but its silent assumption that once the West Bank is dealt with, peace will fall into place in the Mideast.

Unfortunately, that is simply not the case. The real problem has never been who gets the West Bank. The real problem has always been the failure to deal responsibly with the Arab end of the great Mideast population exchange that occurred in 1948, 1949, and the 1950's. In those years, hundreds of thousands of Arabs fled from what is now Israel. And hundreds of thousands of Jews fled from the Arab countries to Israel. The Jews who fled the Arab countries were integrated into Israel at Israeli expense. But, by and large, the Arabs who fled Israel were not integrated into the Arab lands to which they fled. Rather, by quiet agreement between those states and the United Nations Refugee and Works Administration—the latter financed in considerable measure by the United States—the Arab refugees were denied citizenship by the Arab states in which they came to live and were denied the opportunity to integrate themselves into the economic lives of those countries. So it is that we have refugee camps for Palestinians who fled Israel more than a third of a century after the event—and for their children and their grandchildren—though we have no refugee camps for the Jews who fled the Arab lands at that same time.

There is little prospect that the West Bank can absorb all of those Palestinian refugees. Some 3 million Palestinian Arabs live outside Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza. According to the U.N., there are approximately 420,000 Palestinians in camps in Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. It is impossible to estimate what portion of these refugees would want to settle on the West Bank. But it is certain the West Bank cannot absorb more than a handful—probably just over 100,000—of additional inhabitants unless some major technological leap is made in solving the West Bank's water shortage. Even in the unlikely event that the technology of irrigation, and water distribution and disposal improves remarkably, many feel the area could hold no more than double its current population, or 1.6 million.

These figures indicate that the West Bank alone cannot solve the Palestinian refugee problem. Arab leaders must act responsibly toward these populations. If the administration wants peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, it must make clear that those Arab neighbors must assume the same responsibility for Arab refugees that Israel did for Jewish refugees. The West Bank alone clearly cannot provide this. ●

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SPACE EXPLORATION

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1982, the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian commemorated 25 years of space exploration. A small ceremony was held to preview a new exhibit in the museum,

and Mr. R. L. Walquist, vice president and general manager of the TRW Space and Technology Group was the principal speaker.

Mr. Walquist very concisely summarized the results of those 25 years in his brief speech. Of course he could have spoken for hours but by recounting in a very few minutes all our achievements—by naming one success after another—he dramatically illustrated the great, cumulative progress we have made. Indeed, we tend to take for granted that there will always be such progress, but we must remember that our earlier progress and the consequent benefits followed large initial investments by the Federal Government. We must make further investment today to insure tomorrow's benefits.

Mr. Speaker, as the Shuttle becomes first operational and then routine we must not take it and our space program for granted, NASA is working hard to make Shuttle flights almost an everyday occurrence. They hope eventually to achieve 40 launches per year and if each flight lasts 5 days this will mean that at any given time there will be a Shuttle in orbit more often than not. As it becomes routine, we must not lose the excitement of space exploration. As we will be using the Shuttle routinely to transport us to space, we must concentrate our attention on the work being done there—the scientific results, the applications, the commercial ventures which build upon what we have already done.

In his fine speech at the Air and Space Museum, Mr. Walquist brilliantly recalled our historical successes, which form the basis for and point the way to our future. I would like to share this with my colleagues and, therefore, I want to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM—25 YEARS OF SPACE EXPLORATION
(By R. L. Walquist)

Thank you very much, Mr. Walter Boyne, and good evening ladies and gentlemen. It is a great honor for me to be here at the National Air and Space Museum tonight to help welcome you to a preview of a very exciting new exhibit commemorating 25 years of space exploration.

I think it is appropriate at this time that we take a few minutes to remember some of the great space achievements of this past quarter of a century; to touch on a few of the benefits which have occurred to mankind because of it; and, finally, I would like to give you my opinion of some national space objectives which should be high on our priority list as we move into the next 25 years.

THE HISTORY

Twenty-five years ago tomorrow was the first day of the International Geophysical Year. This was an event which stimulated space exploration and led mankind to take its first steps away from the security of the Planet Earth into the unexplored reaches of space.

In October 1957, Sputnik was placed in orbit around the Earth. In January 1958,

Explorer 1 was sent into orbit by a Jupiter C launch vehicle. The space adventure had started. For the balance of the 1950's, we tried many different space feats including unsuccessful space probes to the Moon. We discovered, and mapped, the Van Allen Radiation Belt that circles the Earth, and we sent back the first crude television pictures of our planet from space.

The decade of the 1960's probably contained the most spectacular advances in space exploration. After briefly testing the new environment of space on mice and monkeys, we declared this new frontier "fit for humans" with the Mercury Program and John Glenn's historic orbital flight in 1962. Several Mercury flights and the very successful two-man Gemini flights followed to pave the way for man's next giant step.

President Kennedy declared his intention to land a man on the Moon before the end of the decade, and we did just that when Neil Armstrong made his "small step for man and giant step for mankind" in 1969. The Apollo series was truly spectacular and showed man's ability to conquer the "New Frontier" and rise to the challenges and technological demands of the "Space Age." Mankind would never again be earth-bound.

The 60's also saw us laying the foundations for future applications of space to benefit man here on Earth. Navigation satellites like Transit, weather satellites such as Tiros, established the feasibility of using space for services to help our daily lives.

In a period of seven months, from July 1962 to February 1963, a trio of experimental satellites were launched that would have a major impact on our lives here on Earth. These were the Relay, Telstar, and Syncom communications satellites. Before the end of the decade, the world's first global, commercial communications satellite system, Intelsat III, was established. Man would never again be ignorant of events happening around his world.

The decade of the 70's saw many spectacular events in the Planetary Exploration Program. We explored the atmosphere of Venus and examined the planet Mercury. We landed on the planet Mars and, much to the disappointment of many, found no water in its canals and no Martians. We saw the first spectacular close-up pictures of Jupiter and Saturn. These programs generated much new scientific data and significantly increased man's understanding of the solar system, and clearly established the uniqueness of the third planet from the Sun—Earth. We also established several space applications systems a part of our daily life here on Earth. The Landsat Program gave us spectacular data on earth resources which have been of immense practical value in water conservation, forestry management, crop improvements, geological surveys, and oil exploration. The Nimbus and Tiros weather satellites have significantly improved our ability to forecast weather and their cloud cover maps are a regular item on TV news shows.

The most spectacular advancement was in communication satellites. The international Comsat area increased its capability by more than an order of magnitude with the evolution of the Intelsat IV and V systems. Domestic communications systems became established with the introduction of Westar, Satcom, Comstar and the Canadian Anik system. Space had finally come "down to Earth!"

At the end of the '70's, and into the early 1980's, the civilian space program has concentrated on the development of Shuttle, an

exciting new space transportation system that will be the cornerstone of our space activities for the next decade and beyond.

To date, our space program has been spectacular and extremely successful. Much of the credit for this is due to the outstanding technological excellence and high quality performance of all the U.S. aerospace companies over the last 25 years.

THE BENEFITS

The spin-off benefits from the space program have been many. Major industries have developed on Earth as a result of space technology: computers, microelectronics, and advanced communications systems, to name a few; medical techniques on Earth have been improved by space technology. The Viking spacecraft, which landed on Mars, alone spawned several advances in medical devices. The technology which has gone into the computer enhancement of photos from our planetary probes has been put to work sharpening the images from human X-rays and from ultra-sound probes which examine blood flow and diagnose arterial blockages. The space communications business today generates more revenue in one year than the total NASA investments in that technology over the past 23 years!

Let us not underestimate another major benefit from our space program—national pride. Space exploration events are spectacular, get good coverage by the media, and instill a justifiable sense of pride in the American people. This same awareness and pride have motivated many of our young people to enter careers in science and engineering and to accept the technical challenges of the next generation.

THE FUTURE

A new national space policy is due to be released by the Administration any day now. In these days of extremely tight budgets it is imperative that we develop a well thought out space plan (within the space policy guidelines) and implement it without major, and costly, changes of direction over the next decade.

In an attempt to conserve dollars, we should look for more synergy between military and civilian space technology development, where it makes sense and does not jeopardize our national security. For instance, as a part of the space transportation system, including advance, lower cost, orbital transfer vehicles; possibly new, high frequency, communications technology.

Clearly, our number one space priority at this time must be to get Shuttle operational and use it as the cornerstone upon which to build our new space ventures. STS-4 is flying overhead today, some 160 miles up there. This is the last of the four orbital tests. STS-5, to be launched in November, is designated as the first operational Shuttle and will carry a pair of communications satellites for commercial, paying customers. However, development work will still continue on Shuttle until it becomes a dependable, cost-effective space transportation system. This should be achieved over the next two to three years.

We need to continue a well planned, sustained program of space exploration. This must include astrophysics programs such as the Gamma Ray Observatory, the Space Telescope, the Advanced X-Ray Astrophysics Facility, and the Solar Optical Telescope. We must also include a planetary and interplanetary program which presently has scheduled only one new vehicle for the 1980's, Galileo.

We also need to take the next step and establish man's permanent presence in space. An evolutionary manned space station, launched and tended by Shuttle, will extend the scientific and applications capabilities of Shuttle, the European Spacelab, and of Man. This new national initiative will provide focus for NASA and the civilian space industry into the next century.

There is a quote from that great author, James Michener, that I like to use and I think it is a very appropriate way to end my talk tonight:

"A nation which loses its forward thrust is in danger, and one of the most effective ways to retain that thrust is to keep exploring possibilities. The sense of exploration is intimately bound up with human resolve, and for a nation to believe that it is still committed to forward motion is to ensure its continuance."

Thank you, and good evening.●

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES IN MARYLAND

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the State of Maryland in recent years has developed an emergency medical services system that ranks among the best in the Nation, and it is very fitting that our Governor has proclaimed this week as Emergency Medical Services Week to honor the people who make the system work.

I commend those personnel, who serve with great commitment and without much public recognition, I share the sentiments expressed in the proclamation.

Through the tireless and selfless efforts of emergency medical technicians, cardiac rescue technicians, aviation trauma technicians, nurses and physicians, all Marylanders are assured of a superior level of emergency medical care; and

Through many years of research, dedication and service, Maryland has established an outstanding EMS system which has won worldwide acclaim; and

It is fitting that our citizens recognize the 10,000 emergency medical technicians, and 1,200 cardiac rescue technicians, most of whom are volunteers, and our many medical and fire associates who devote themselves to administering the highest calibre of emergency medical care; and

It is important that all citizens become aware that trauma is the third leading killer in the United States and realize that preventative measures and an advanced and active EMS system are the most effective deterrents of trauma death.●

PROTRACTED NUCLEAR WAR

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, since the unsuccessful vote August 5 on the call for a nuclear arms freeze, public

and congressional attention has turned away from arms reduction policy. Before the vote, there were massive demonstrations, a great deal of media attention, and large grass roots citizen participation. Since then efforts to end the nuclear arms race have been subdued. There is legislation still before Congress calling for a genuine nuclear freeze (H.R. Res. 571), for adoption of nuclear test ban treaties and for a policy for minimizing the risk of nuclear war (S. Res. 444). However, it appears unlikely they will be considered before the 97th Congress comes to a close. This is most disturbing to me since there still is not consensus on what U.S. arms control policy is. Last August 6 an editorial appeared in my State's largest newspaper, the Hartford Courant, which asks several very good questions on where U.S. policy is headed. As the article correctly concludes, it is terrifying. I commend the article to my colleagues.

PROTRACTED NUCLEAR WAR

What is the Reagan administration up to in arms control?

The question came in the form of a resolution, sponsored by 21 U.S. senators last week. Statements and actions by the president "have caused anxiety at home and abroad," said the chief sponsor, Sen. John C. Danforth, Republican from Missouri.

Anxiety does not quite describe the situation. The Reagan policy is downright terrifying. Plans apparently are being drawn to fight and win a nuclear war of several months duration. Mr. Reagan and the National Security Council reportedly are expected to give this scheme, which includes an \$18 billion command and communications center, their approval.

At one time, only generals came up with such bizarre options, as part of a pseudo-intellectual exercise that no civilian government actually would dare develop into a plan. No more. Six-month-long nuclear wars are actually being considered, at the highest level of government, as survivable and, incredibly, winnable.

The pattern of a radically new direction in policy has been evident for more than a year. Mr. Reagan has asked for relaxation of export controls on nuclear fuel and sensitive nuclear technologies. He has deferred negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty. He has raised the possibility of abrogating the 1972 ABM Treaty, which imposes limits on defense against ballistic missile weapons.

Mr. Reagan has refused to send to the Senate, for ratification, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. Chemical weapons are to be developed. The president is unhappy with the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972, prohibiting the production, development, stockpiling, transfer and use of chemical and biological weapons.

The pattern has alarmed a bipartisan group of 21 U.S. senators. Several former negotiators of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have expressed apprehension, as have former secretaries of state who served in Republican and Democratic administrations. Allies in Western Europe have sent messages of "serious concern," noting the mass demonstrations against nuclear arms.

Mr. Reagan maintains that he supports significant and mutual reductions in arms,

but with major qualifications. He will not sign agreements which do not have on-site verification procedures, because, he reminds critics, one cannot trust the Soviet Union. He will not sign an agreement until U.S. rearmament takes place.

These qualifications bar the signing of any meaningful arms control agreement during Mr. Reagan's term, unless he were to reverse himself. But a change in direction does not seem probable—not when the approval of a plan to win a nuclear war lasting perhaps half a year is on the president's agenda of feasible contingencies.

Terrifying.●

POST'S IMPRUDENT POLARIZATION OF NONPROLIFERATION

HON. MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter to the editor of the Washington Post by Deputy Secretary of Energy W. Kenneth Davis. This thoughtful letter, which appeared in the August 25 issue of the Post, deplors that newspaper's polarization of the nuclear nonproliferation issue.

I find it ironic that the Post has chosen the Carter administration's nonproliferation policies as the high standard against which to judge the Reagan approach. Indeed, the Post's characterization is such a gross misreading of contemporary history that it is no wonder that its staff must continually resort to hyperbole in order to obscure this fact.

In point of fact, the Carter approach to nonproliferation was totally non-productive. Not only did it stimulate the proliferation of nuclear suppliers worldwide, but it also simultaneously caused us to lose significant nuclear export business and lessened our ability to influence the nuclear policies of other nations.

If the United States is to maintain a major leadership role in nuclear nonproliferation area in the years ahead, then we must adopt a genuine selective approach which carefully distinguishes those who wish to pursue peaceful nuclear power programs and those who represent real proliferation threats. The Post's continual advocacy of a return to a simpleminded, non-workable, and discredited policy is not only unrealistic, but dangerous.

The letter follows:

WHY POLARIZE THE NUCLEAR ISSUE?

(By W. Kenneth Davis)

As one who had devoted much of his life to the goals of developing the beneficial uses of nuclear energy and at the same time taking strong and effective measures to restrain nuclear proliferation, I deplore the tone of The Post's editorial "The Bomb Trade" [Aug. 9] and disagree with its representation. That editorial characterized the

Reagan administration as insensitive to the nuclear nonproliferation issue. It asserted that the administration has displayed "contempt" for previous U.S. policies of keeping sensitive weapons-making materials and technologies away from inappropriate countries. And it also implied that the administration has no basic nonproliferation policy other than to ease the barriers on nuclear exports.

I believe it is a regrettable tendency on The Post's part to treat the nonproliferation issue in a polarized and biased fashion, which is contrary to the public interest.

President Reagan and this administration, like all recent administrations, deeply believe that the potential spread of nuclear weapons is a serious threat to global peace and security. Like its predecessors, the Reagan administration has been a strong advocate of the nonproliferation treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, of the concept of full-scope safeguards where appropriate, of strengthening International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and controls, and of other measures to avoid the spread of sensitive materials and technology to countries that might use them for making nuclear weapons.

The current administration differs specifically from the previous administration in dealing with Japan and those countries in Western Europe that already have operating nuclear power programs. All of these countries have excellent nonproliferation credentials, having either signed the nonproliferation treaty or agreed to abide by its requirements. Unfortunately, these particular countries, as well as others, viewed the policies of the previous administration as designed to disrupt their domestic nuclear programs, as unilateral in character and as incompatible with their needs for energy self-sufficiency. Hence, serious tensions arose in our normal relationships, even though President Carter alleged that he had no intention of interfering with the progress of their nuclear programs.

Moreover, the efforts of the previous administration in deferring U.S. domestic reprocessing and breeder programs had little or no effect on the direction of the Japanese and European programs, or on those of other countries. Each country's programs continued to advance; only the U.S. nuclear programs suffered technologically and commercially as a consequence of these policies.

Against this background, the Reagan administration is seeking to restore good working partnerships with Japan and Western Europe. In addition, we are trying to reestablish our own technological leadership and global influence by showing that the United States can be a reliable partner through credible export policies—export policies that strengthen and are consistent with nonproliferation objectives. We believe we cannot positively influence foreign nuclear programs if we are perceived as more interested in changing other countries' policies than in helping them meet their energy needs.

As a realistic matter, we believe that the United States must be selective in its international nuclear relationships, and we will differentiate between nations that possess good nonproliferation credentials and nations that do not. Those countries that are risks will not be sold critical American technology, and we will do everything possible to convince other nuclear supplier countries to refrain from selling to those countries as well.

The Post is incorrect in suggesting that we are abandoning prudent export controls.

Several of the exports The Post has publicized in recent weeks are, in my view, not sensitive, or even relevant, from a realistic proliferation standpoint. In fact, the Department of Energy, along with the Department of State and others, conducts detailed reviews of export applications and will always use conservative criteria in rendering final judgments on applications. Moreover, we are not subordinating nonproliferation values to command gains. Rather, our objective is to restore U.S. credibility and influence by restoring predictability to our international relationships with countries having ongoing commercial nuclear power programs.●

H.R. 6307, THE RCRA REAUTHORIZATION ACT—CLOSING THE HAZARDOUS WASTE BURNING LOOPHOLE

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives passed last week H.R. 6307, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Reauthorization Act of 1982 by the overwhelming margin of 317-32. I strongly support it, and during the debate I addressed the necessity to regulate small quantity generators of hazardous wastes.

H.R. 6307 also includes provisions of particular importance to New York State, and to New York City and my district in particular. I have expressed my strong concerns about hazardous wastes being sold as fuel, or mixed with heating oil, posing a major health and environmental problem. But EPA has exempted from RCRA regulations the blending and burning of hazardous wastes for energy recovery.

The RCRA Reauthorization Act, H.R. 6307, closes this major regulatory loophole that now exempts from regulation one-half of all hazardous wastes generated in this country. Twenty million metric tons a year are burned in boilers, cement kilns, and other units that are not subject to EPA's hazardous waste regulatory program. A recent study done by Fred C. Hart Associates for SCA Services, the leading high-technology hazardous waste treatment company in the country, estimates that such uncontrolled burning may mean 1.2 million tons of pollutants are emitted annually—300 times more pollutants than EPA allows for an incinerator complying with applicable standards. I ask that a summary of that report be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

Unknown quantities of hazardous wastes are being blended with heating oil, diesel oil, and gasoline and are sold to consumers. EPA does not require any recordkeeping or data on this practice, let alone regulate it. The State of Michigan recently estimated

that as much as 1 billion gallons of blended fuel may be sold annually in Michigan alone. The burning of inappropriate wastes in inappropriate boilers poses direct health risks to the individuals exposed, as well as contributes to overall air pollution. The selling of adulterated fuel to unknowing consumers may also mean their boilers are being damaged by hazardous wastes, and they are paying for heating value in the fuel that they are not receiving.

National media attention on hazardous wastes as a fuel has focused on New York City and the metropolitan area. Several Federal and State investigations are ongoing. I ask unanimous consent that articles on fuel blending abuses be included at the end of my remarks.

New York State is moving aggressively to deal with improper fuel-burning practices. New regulations are being proposed to regulate the burning of used oils, waste oils, and solvents in stationary sources to have a legally enforceable mechanism to prevent pollution caused by the burning of waste fuels. Without these regulations, the New York Department of Environmental Conservation says that "fuel dealers and owners and operators of air contamination sources currently would have no internal incentives to abate their emissions without these regulations." The proposed regulations, which I ask be included at the end of my remarks, will also take away the economic advantage now enjoyed by illicit fuel dealers, who currently sell adulterated fuel oil for which they pay less than they would for virgin fuel oil.

The New York State proposal to establish standards for waste fuels that may be burned, and also for the facility burning waste fuels, includes a prohibition on burning waste fuels in any facility of less than 1 million Btu's. New York State also is proposing reporting, sampling and analysis, and recordkeeping (including sources and destinations) of fuel oil and waste fuel.

The New York proposal for boiler standards is similar to regulations governing boilers now in effect in New Jersey. New Jersey allows burning of hazardous wastes in boilers if the boiler is greater than 50 million Btu per hour, has an air quality permit, burns for the primary purpose of recovering useful heat, and the amount of wastes burned does not exceed 10 percent by weight of the total material burned. Revisions to lower the Btu threshold, but add additional controls, are being considered.

Rhode Island currently regulates as incinerators boilers which burn hazardous wastes generated offsite and is proposing to regulate onsite generated wastes. Rhode Island is proposing also to establish a 1 million Btu cutoff, and

to require a regulatory program that essentially tracks the regulations that would be required by H.R. 6307.

California requires a permit program that basically parallels EPA's incinerator requirements, issued on a case-by-case basis, usually with the involvement of the air quality program.

But numerous States are able to regulate hazardous waste burning only if EPA regulates it, and cannot go beyond EPA's program. Thus, in the current absence of any EPA program, they cannot do anything to fill the EPA regulatory void. Interstate enforcement also is a problem. This is why a national program, as required by section 6 of H.R. 6307, is so urgently needed.

Mr. Speaker, New York State, as usual, is far ahead of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The RCRA reauthorization bill will require EPA to close the regulatory loopholes for burning and blending of hazardous wastes. Section 6 will require notification to EPA by the owners and operators of facilities burning or blending hazardous wastes, and by persons selling blended fuels. Any person subject to the notification requirements is prohibited from selling a blended fuel if the bill of sale does not contain a warning label and an identification of the included wastes. This will help prevent the kind of consumer protection abuses found in New York City.

The bill also will require EPA to develop regulations under section 3004 governing burning and blending. I hope that EPA will draw upon New York's experience to assure that regulations will be promulgated within the statutory deadline. In particular, I want to reiterate the committee's urging that EPA phase in its regulations, so that the development of final performance standards need not hold up EPA proposing such interim measures as recommended in the Hart report and proposed by New York, that is, manifesting, reporting, record-keeping, sampling, and analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism, its chairman, Mr. FLORIO, and the ranking member and neighboring New Yorker, Mr. LENT, for their initiative in acting so responsibly and so promptly to end the abusive fuel-burning practices in the New York metropolitan area. I hope the Senate will act promptly on this crucial legislation.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 1982]

USE OF TOXIC WASTES IN GAS AND HEATING OIL SUSPECTED

(By Joseph P. Fried)

Federal and state investigators are looking into reports that significant amounts of heating oil, diesel oil and gasoline have been adulterated with toxic chemical wastes before being sold to consumers in the New York metropolitan area.

How frequent such adulteration might have been and the degree to which it may

be continuing is not clear, the investigators say. But "there are indications" that, it has been carried on to a considerable extent, at least as far as heating oil is concerned, according to Jeremiah McKenna, counsel to the New York State Select Committee on Crime, one of the bodies looking into the matter.

Health specialists say that motorists who use adulterated gasoline and occupants of buildings where adulterated heating oil is used could be endangered, as could employees who handle the substances. The specialists also say the contaminated fuel oil or gasoline could add to environmental pollution generally.

Some of the wastes suspected of having been used have been linked to cancer.

According to the investigators and to industry spokesmen—who are themselves concerned about the problem—the adulteration has been engaged in by wholesalers and retailers seeking to boost profits or to undercut competitors who sell unadulterated products. There is no indication of involvement by the major oil producers, one investigator said.

Other investigators said that the offending fuel and gasoline companies worked with other companies that were in the business of disposing of toxic chemical wastes. Sometimes, they said, the waste-disposal companies and the suppliers of the adulterated fuel were one and the same.

Representative Guy V. Molinari said he believed that the reported abuses in the New York area were part of a larger problem. The Staten Island Republican, who is a member of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, said that testimony at a subcommittee hearing indicated that the problem of "lacing" heating fuel with toxic substances "exists in many of the states."

In New York, the office of the State Attorney General, Robert Abrams, has "a number of specific cases under investigation" in which "adulteration of fuel oil by toxic materials" is believed to have occurred, according to Timothy Gilles, a spokesman for the office.

FEDERAL INQUIRIES REPORTED

Two Federal grand juries, one in Manhattan and one in Brooklyn, are also reported to be looking into the subject or preparing to do so. The investigation in Brooklyn is reportedly part of an overall inquiry into charges that some gasoline wholesalers and retailers in the metropolitan area have enhanced their profits through various illicit schemes that also include tax evasion.

Some investigators not involved with the Brooklyn inquiry said that, because of the nature of the products, it seemed that the adulteration of gasoline would be less successful than the adulteration of heating or diesel oil. But sources who are familiar with the inquiry said that the allegations that gasoline had also been adulterated were being looked into.

The Brooklyn inquiry is being conducted by the Justice Department's Organized Crime Strike Force for the Eastern District of New York. Its head, Thomas P. Puccio, declined to comment.

The separate Federal inquiry in Manhattan is said to be part of an investigation into the overall matter of the illegal disposal of toxic wastes. Previous public statements about this inquiry have dealt with charges that the wastes had been dumped at New York City landfills and into sewers. But last week, officials said that the investigation

also covered the disposal of the wastes by mixing them into fuels.

"It's fair to say we're investigating all aspects of the illegal disposal of toxic chemical wastes," said John F. Kaley, an assistant United States Attorney in Manhattan. His office is cooperating with the State Select Committee on Crime, which is headed by State Senator Ralph J. Marino of Oyster Bay, L.I.

Mr. McKenna, the state committee's counsel, said that one of the toxic wastes suspected of being illicitly used to adulterate heating and diesel oil is benzene. This substance is normally used in the manufacture of such things as varnishes and dyes.

Dr. Bernard Davidow, an assistant New York City health commissioner, said that use of heating or diesel oil mixed with benzene could be hazardous if vapors from the illicit products escaped from the tanks in which they were stored. As for burning such substances, he said that if they were "completely burned, then there is no problem" because "you end up with carbon dioxide and water."

But if a furnace of diesel engine cannot burn the mixed product completely, he said, the resulting smoke or fumes could contain contaminants.

IMPACT OF BURNING OF HAZARDOUS WASTE IN BOILERS

(Prepared by Fred C. Hart Associates, Inc.)

Fred C. Hart Associates, Inc. was retained by SCA Services, Inc. to conduct a study comparing the potential environmental and public health impacts of the combustion of hazardous waste in industrial and commercial boilers as compared to hazardous waste incinerators. The results of that study are summarized as follows, which describe:

The issue—That hazardous wastes are substantially unregulated if burned in industrial or commercial boilers.

The risks—That far greater numbers of people are exposed to higher concentrations of hazardous air pollutants when wastes are burned in boilers.

The recommendation—That existing regulatory loopholes be closed through a national program establishing minimum regulatory safeguards.

THE ISSUES

1. Under a loophole in the RCRA regulations, hazardous wastes are substantially unregulated if burned in industrial or commercial boilers to recover usable energy:

A hazardous waste identified by one of the four RCRA tests (i.e., for toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, or reactivity) is not regulated:

A generator need not notify USEPA that he generates the waste; the manifest system need not be used for waste shipments; and the regulatory safeguards that govern treatment, storage, and disposal facilities (such as contingency plans, inspection plans, closure plans, and recordkeeping and reporting requirements) do not apply.

A hazardous waste which is listed is subject to certain minimal requirements: USEPA must be notified, the manifest system must be used, and certain storage requirements must be complied with.

Most important, boilers which are burning hazardous waste need not comply with strict standards for design, construction, and operation which apply to hazardous waste incinerators. Incinerators must:

Conduct test burns to show that 99.99 percent of the principal organic hazardous constituents are destroyed or removed; control

emissions of particulate matter (such as heavy metals) and hydrogen chlorides, with emission control systems such as wet scrubbers and/or electrostatic precipitators; and continuously monitor key operating parameters such as the combustion temperature, waste and air feed rate, and carbon monoxide emissions to assure optimal operating conditions.

Fuel blenders are not regulated as treatment, storage, and disposal facilities. Furthermore, shipment of blended fuels does not require a manifest or any type of notice.

2. While the extent of waste combustion in boilers is unknown, the use of the practice is extensive:

Industry has a strong incentive to burn waste in boilers because (1) it simplifies or eliminates the need to comply with RCRA requirements and (2) it provides for cost savings of roughly \$2.00 for each gallon of fuel oil replaced by waste as fuel (\$0.95 per gallon for fuel oil not used plus \$1.00 per gallon for costs of hazardous waste disposal avoided).

A recent USEPA study estimated that roughly 20 million tons out of approximately 40 million tons of hazardous waste generated annually are currently burned as fuel in boilers.

COMBUSTION OF WASTE IN BOILERS

1. There are approximately two million industrial and commercial boilers in the United States. Large boilers provide the major portion of boiler capacity:

3 percent with capacities over 10 million BTU per hour account for about two-thirds of the firing capacity.

1.6 percent with capacities over 25 million BTU per hour account for about half of the firing capacity.

2. Boiler emissions are affected by a variety of factors:

Small boilers have lower destruction efficiencies than large boilers because of shorter residence time and other operational parameters.

If waste has different properties than the fuel for which a boiler was designed, a decrease in combustion efficiency will result, which will reduce the waste destruction efficiency.

In actual field operations, the waste destruction efficiency will be even lower as the result of system deterioration and less than optimal operating conditions.

3. Available data indicates that destruction efficiencies as high as 99.99 percent may be achievable in large, well maintained and carefully operated boilers, but that lower destruction efficiencies—from 97.0 percent to 99.9 percent—are more likely to be found in the field, with some small boilers as low as 95 percent.

4. Hence emissions of contaminants will be significantly higher:

	<i>Emissions, percent of feed</i>
Incinerator (99.99 percent destruction removal efficiency).....	0.01
Boiler (99.9 percent destruction efficiency).....	0.10
Boiler (99.0 percent destruction efficiency).....	1.00
Boiler (97.0 percent destruction efficiency).....	3.00

INCREMENTAL RISK ANALYSIS

1. The incremental effects on air contaminant levels and the attendant health risks were addressed by conducting an atmospheric dispersion modeling study to estimate the level of human exposure to emitted pollutants.

2. Methodology—Five waste combustion scenarios were evaluated:

A hazardous waste incinerator with the required waste destruction efficiency of 99.99 percent.

Three average-sized boilers with a waste destruction efficiency of 99.9 percent—the upper end to be expected in an industrial boiler.

Three average-sized boilers with an efficiency of 97 percent—the expected performance under actual field operations.

Fifteen small boilers with a waste destruction efficiency of 99 percent—the upper end to be expected in a small industrial boiler.

Fifteen small boilers with an efficiency of 97 percent—the expected performance under actual field operations.

Five widely used waste constituents were analyzed:

The benzene component of ethylene manufacturing waste.

The styrene component of ethylene manufacturing waste.

Toluene.
Stoddard solvent.

The trimethyl benzene component of Stoddard solvent.

Twenty-five scenarios (five combustion scenarios/five wastes) were assessed in an atmospheric dispersion/population exposure analysis using USEPA Population Exposure Model.

3. The results show that far greater numbers of people are exposed to higher concentrations of hazardous air pollutants under all boiler scenarios compared to the incinerator scenario (Figure 1). The difference is extremely pronounced at lower destruction efficiencies (e.g. 97 percent).

ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVE

1. Other factors increase the hazard potential of emissions from boilers burning hazardous waste:

The destruction efficiencies used in the model are representative of better on-site combustion. In practice, wastes shipped off-site under the RCRA loophole may wind up in poorly operated facilities with much lower destruction efficiencies.

The scenario analyzed wastes that are good fuel substitutes. In practice, wastes with poor combustion properties (high chlorine content, poor burning characteristics) may be burned in boilers to avoid regulation. This would result in greater emissions of potentially hazardous organic matter and hydrogen chloride.

In an actual urban industrial station, a much greater number of boilers than those assumed in the study scenarios will be burning waste, which would increase public health risks.

Any real life situation would involve exposure to other sources of the modeled constituents, other hazardous air contaminants, and other sources of exposure (i.e. workplace exposure), thus increasing exposure levels and enhancing the potential for synergism.

Combustion of waste in boilers is likely to increase exposure to higher levels of potentially hazardous products of incomplete combustion as well as unburned waste constituents.

POTENTIAL NATIONAL IMPACT

1. All people living in industrialized areas are exposed to contaminants emitted from industrial boilers and would therefore be additionally exposed to potentially hazardous waste combustion process emissions if a number of these boilers burned hazardous waste.

2. If 20 million tons of hazardous waste is burned annually, the difference in annual emissions between the RCRA incinerator standard of 99.99 percent and the expected boiler destruction efficiency of 97 percent is 4,000 tons as compared to 1,200,000 tons—a factor of 300 to 1.

3. The potential increased national exposure is estimated at 147 million people, or 68 percent of the population.

STATE REGULATORY STATUS

1. Several states, including New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and California, have developed programs to regulate burning of hazardous waste in boilers. Nevertheless, regulation at the state level is limited and inconsistent at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The existing regulatory loophole should be closed through a national program establishing minimum regulatory safeguards. The regulatory program should be carefully designed so as not to be burdensome to implement or onerous to comply with.

2. A workable regulatory program should be based on the following principles:

Waste combustion should be prohibited in boilers smaller than 25 million BTU per hour. This would eliminate boilers unsuited for effectively burning hazardous waste and reduce the number potentially in need of regulation from two million to 34,000.

Larger boilers should be permitted. Those which can meet the incinerator standards would be permitted to burn all appropriate hazardous wastes. Those which can safely burn particular wastes would be permitted to handle those wastes. A system of class permits should be used.

An exempt waste list—those wastes that cause no greater environmental or health risks than the fuels displaced—should be developed.

A prohibited waste list—those wastes that should never be burned in boilers unless they meet incinerator standards—should be developed.

3. The regulatory program should be implemented on a phased basis:

An interim program for the next two years should accomplish these objectives:

To bring boilers burning hazardous waste into the RCRA regulatory system;

To assure a minimum degree of protection of public health and the environment; and

To development of a better data base for a long-term program.

A full regulatory program should include performance and operating standards for all boilers burning hazardous waste.

4. The annualized costs of the regulatory program would be:

\$7,000 per facility for the interim program.

\$76,000 per facility for the full regulatory program.

5. As shown in Table 1, the savings in fuel costs from burning waste will significantly offset the increased compliance costs for most facilities burning substantial quantities of hazardous waste. For a 60 million BTU per hour boiler, the annual savings in fuel costs range from \$250,000 to \$2,500,000 depending on the percent waste burned, while annual compliance costs for the full program are estimated at \$76,000. For a 25 million BTU per hour boiler, the annual savings range from \$105,000 to \$1,040,000 depending on the percent waste burned, while annual compliance costs are also \$76,000.

EXAMPLE REGULATORY COMPLIANCE COSTS AND SAVINGS

Boiler size	Program cost		Annual savings	
	Interim	Annual full	Dollars	Percent of fuel replaced by waste
60 million Btu/hour	\$7,000	\$76,000	2,500,000	(50)
			2,000,000	(40)
			1,500,000	(30)
			1,000,000	(20)
			500,000	(10)
25 million Btu/hour	\$7,000	\$76,000	1,040,000	(50)
			830,000	(40)
			625,000	(30)
			420,000	(20)
			210,000	(10)
			105,000	(5)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, due of official business, I was unable to be present on the House floor yesterday, September 15. Had I been present, however, I would have cast my vote in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 321, the Shipping Act of 1982, "yea."

Rollcall No. 322, the Patent Term Restoration Act of 1982, "yea."

Rollcall No. 323, the Federal Boat Safety Act Amendments, "yea."

Rollcall No. 324, Sailing School Vessels Act of 1982, "nay."

Rollcall No. 325, technical corrections in health laws, "nay."

Rollcall No. 326, Pretrial Services Act of 1982, "yea."

Rollcall No. 329, an amendment to the HUD/Independent Agencies appropriations bill, to increase the funding for EPA research and development activities by \$25 million, "no."

Rollcall No. 330, an amendment to the HUD/Independent Agencies appropriations bill to delete \$140 million for the continued integration of the NASA Centaur high energy upper stage into the Space Shuttle, "no."

Rollcall No. 331, an amendment to the HUD/Independent Agencies appropriations bill that prohibits the use of funds by EPA to implement a mandatory inspection and maintenance program for vehicle emissions, "aye."

Rollcall No. 332, HUD/Independent Agencies appropriation bill for fiscal 1983, "yea."●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE WEEK

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, September 12 to 18 marks the fifth consecutive year of National Hispanic Heritage Week. The theme for this year is "Su Voto Es Su Voz" or "Your Vote is Your Voice."

In honor of this week, Mr. Speaker, it is only appropriate that we pay special tribute to the outstanding and vital contributions Hispanic Americans continue to make in our country.

Since the birth of our great Nation, Hispanic men and women helped forge new frontiers through the early establishment of settlements and missions across America. This great spirit of achievement is evidenced today in the lasting contributions Hispanic Americans have made in the field of politics, art, industry, science, technology and other important areas.

In my 29th Congressional District of California, Hispanic Americans have enriched the community with their intellectual and cultural achievements. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to associate myself with the agenda of events which will honor the proud history of our Hispanic brothers and sisters during National Hispanic Heritage Week.●

A CALL FOR AN END OF U.S. SUPPORT FOR MARCOS ABUSES

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, in one's private life, one feels a certain reluctance to greet an invited guest with anything less than politeness; one certainly would not want to point out that one wishes the guest had not come. I do not feel the same reluctance in discussing the visit of President Ferdinand Marcos to the United States. Today, President Reagan receives President Marcos at the White House. I wish that such a visit, President Marcos' first visit since 1964, was not taking place.

This visit does a great injustice to the people of the Philippines and to those of us in the United States who believe that increasing respect for human rights should be a basic goal of American foreign policy.

Mr. Marcos kicked off preparations for his departure for the United States by arresting dissident labor leaders and by exercising emergency powers he retained despite the nominal lifting of martial law last year.

September 16, 1982

The Marcos family has given little assurance that it will allow democratic changes within the country. Continued U.S. support and encouragement of the regime are contrary not only to fundamental principles of human rights, but also to long-term interests of the United States in the Philippines and in the Pacific.

I am convinced that the United States will ultimately be far worse off by having given such extensive support to President Marcos, his family, and to their regime.

We provide over \$100 million annually in military aid to a government whose military forces are responsible for gross violations of fundamental human rights. The military is a repressive antidemocratic force of terror.

The United States has a tremendous opportunity to encourage the development of democratic practices in the Philippines. Our extensive aid and longstanding cultural ties and warm relations between our two peoples place us in an important position of influence. Unfortunately, the administration has chosen not to exercise the positive potential of our position.

The unqualified and unconditional support for President Marcos and his attempts to suppress legitimate political dissent do nothing to further the principles of human rights about which the people of our country feel so strongly.

Earlier this month, I joined with seven of our colleagues in asking that the invitation to President Marcos be withdrawn. Perhaps it was unrealistic to expect the administration to grant such a request. It is not unrealistic, however, to expect the administration, at least privately, to express to President Marcos the very extensive and very grave reservation in the House regarding continued American moral, political, and economic support for an authoritarian, repressive, and apparent dynastic regime.●

SHIMON PERES AND PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, no one yearns for peace more than the people of Israel whose own security is threatened by war and the risk of war in the Middle East. There are many now in Israel who are giving expression to their strong desire for peace.

One of the most prominent of these is Shimon Peres, the leader of the Labor Party, which is the largest single party in the Knesset. Shimon Peres is emerging as the bright star of hope for peace. His forceful encouragement of the peace process proposed

by President Reagan enhances the prospects for an eventual Middle East negotiated settlement.

Mr. Peres did not embrace the Reagan plan in all its aspects, but he is open to negotiations. In an editorial in the September 12 issue of the *Washington Post*, Shimon Peres demonstrates that he is a man of courage and vision, as he spells out his concept of Israel's needs in the peace process. [From the *Washington Post*, Sept. 12, 1982]

THE REAGAN MIDEAST PLAN—CREATING PARTNERS FOR PEACE
(By Shimon Peres)

The difference between the Israeli-Egyptian peace negotiations and the negotiations that are to be conducted with respect to the Palestinian question lies in the fact that those with Egypt had definite and exclusive partners: Egypt on one side, Israel on the other. Regarding the Palestinian issue, however, there is only one definite side—Israel. It is not altogether clear who is the other side—Jordan, the population of the territories acquired in 1967, or the Palestine Liberation Organization itself.

I think that one of the important and clever aspects of President Reagan's speech of Sept. 1 is that he tried to create partners for negotiations even though no general trend for the negotiations has crystallized. In fact, defining the partners for negotiations is the primary condition in making negotiations possible, and therein lies the advantage of the Reagan plan as compared with former American plans.

In the past, the United States tried several times to propose peace plans—the Dulles and Rogers plans, for instance. But those plans immediately drove away the intended partners instead of bringing them to the table. The truth is that a plan that aspires to define in the opening phases the final character of the solution only stresses all the existing differences between the parties. Those differences can be overcome only by dialogue at the negotiating table. They cannot be solved without negotiations or prior to negotiations.

Reagan has made a special effort to present to the potential partners positive ideas that may bring them to negotiations. But he has not proposed an enforced solution or formalized a final program in unequivocal language.

The conception that lies at the heart of Reagan's speech is interesting in several aspects.

First, he avoids laying out a final program, but he announces what the American position will be in two likely situations: during the transition period and during the negotiations for a lasting solution. Thus has he made clear that a solution cannot be found in one leap but can be achieved in stages. That will make it easier for the parties to conduct their negotiations gradually, as happened with Egypt. In that instance, the American positions were not presented as an order but as an approach based on the wish to serve as a bridge between the parties.

Second, in formulating the American positions, Reagan has attempted to respond to the principal issues in a way that will reassure each side in the opening phases of the negotiations. To Israel, he promises secure and defensible boundaries with no return to the borders of 1967. He says the United States will not support either an additional Palestinian state or negotiations with or rec-

ognition of the PLO as long as the PLO has not recognized the right of Israel to exist and has not agreed to U.N. Security Council Resolution 242.

These assurances to Israel also answer in a certain measure the secret expectations of the Kingdom of Jordan. The establishment of an additional Palestinian state means the establishment of a rival and hostile state not only at the gates of Jerusalem but also at the gates of Amman. King Hussein is sufficiently openminded to recognize that such a state might endanger the security of his country and its peace more than anything else. A separate state under the leadership of the PLO will not rest and will not remain idle until it succeeds in undermining the authority of Hussein in Jordan itself. Obviously, this is something that Hussein can do without.

Moreover, Hussein is promised two substantial things: trade, economic and cultural ties between the West Bank and the Gaza strip and Jordan during the transition period, but without isolating them from Israel, and association between those territories and Jordan in the permanent settlement. The final boundaries between Israel and Jordan will be determined in full negotiations and will take into consideration the security needs of Israel.

To the population of the territories, the Reagan plan presents an opening to take part with Jordan in the negotiations. However, the people there are not promised the "right of self-determination," because this privilege, as Reagan said, is understood in the Middle East as favoring the establishment of an additional Palestinian state. But they were promised "a leading role" in the determination of their future.

Egypt was assured that the American administration remains true to the Camp David Accords, which Egypt considers the cornerstone of the policy it has followed ever since President Anwar Sadat's historic visit to Jerusalem. It is only appropriate to stress the great importance of Egypt's participation in future negotiations. Egypt is the largest and most important Arab country. All parties to negotiations must have the will that the precedent of peace between Israel and Egypt will not go sour.

Third—and, in my opinion, this is decisive—the United States has now stated who it sees as the partners participating in the negotiations. Selecting the partner actually means establishing the relationship to the most favored solution. It may be said that the selection of the partner is almost a condition to giving a chance to the negotiations. Because the truth is that the program repels partners more than it makes partners, whereas the selection of partners can create the possibility of an agreed solution. Reagan prefers Jordan to the PLO, as does Israel, and as secretly also does Jordan and possibly also Egypt. If God forbid, the president preferred the PLO, he would immediately lose Israel as well as Jordan.

Israel cannot conduct negotiations with the PLO: not only because of the PLO's past but because of the geographical map of Israel itself. Israel is settled in its length and not in its breadth. President Reagan has already pointed out that, at its narrowest, Israel does not exceed 10 miles. A country that has been attacked several times in the past not only from the north and south but from the east cannot agree that a hostile army—and a Palestinian army is necessarily an ambitious and hostile army—will be encamped on its narrow hips or at the gates of Jerusalem.

Unfortunately, the difference between the moderates and the extremists in the PLO lies here. The moderates propose to "deal" with Israel in two stages, the first being the establishment of a Palestinian state and the second being an attack by the army of this state on Israel. The extremists in the PLO want to achieve these stages simultaneously, using terror as the most suitable strategy.

No intelligent Israeli can agree either to the moderate program, establishment of a Palestinian army, which is predestined to attack Israel, or to the extremist's program to turn the West Bank and Gaza Strip into a base and state of terrorism. This was the situation that prevailed in Lebanon. On this issue, Israel is united.

On the other hand, it seems possible to achieve an agreement with Jordan, which will rule over the population in the territories, without its army crossing the Jordan River westward. Egypt, too, when it got back the Sinai, agreed of its own will to leave most of the Sinai peninsula demilitarized for the future, in order to release Israel from its suspicion of a sudden Egyptian attack. The Egyptian president can therefore serve future negotiations with Jordan.

Israel will and must insist that its army, which is supported by the network of settlements along the Jordan River, will ensure the security of its eastern border and will prevent the risk of a sudden attack when all those densely populated areas come to be administered by the Kingdom of Jordan and by representatives of the areas. Basically, this also suits the Jordanian interest.

The selection of partners to negotiations can also give an answer to another question—of boundaries. The issue is not as vague as it was in the past. Every modern state distinguishes between formal and informal boundaries, between economic, security and national boundaries. The best economic border is an open one, which makes possible an economic relationship between neighboring countries without unnecessary annoyance. The most secure border is the strategic one—to provide a certain time in the event that a sudden danger might arise. The best national border is that which reduces as much as possible the need of one people to rule over another—the national majority in one country must not rule over a large national minority of another people.

I believe that the basic assumption in Reagan's speech makes it possible to define such borders—or, even better, such a relationship—between the partners to the conflict today and the partners to peace tomorrow. Therein lies its great advantage. We cannot fully identify ourselves with the president's speech. Certainly as an Israeli I think there are some points that we reject, especially on the subject of the future of Jerusalem. Indeed, the president promises that he supports a "united Jerusalem," but that its destiny must be agreed upon in negotiations. Israel today is united in the resolute decision that Jerusalem must remain united in its entirety as the capital of the state of Israel.

Nevertheless, President Reagan's speech is a most realistic basis for negotiations and for the continuation of the peace process in the Middle East, and therefore it is a great asset. The Israeli Labor Party, which I represent, understood long ago that in negotiations and in peace, in contrast to war, there does not exist a sole and crushing decision. Negotiations for peace are built on patience,

on discussion and also on compromise, including territorial compromise.

The attitude of the Labor Party suffered in the past from the fact that its approach did not find sufficient Arab response. I believe that the president's speech will evoke a response in the Arab world directed at avoiding wars and building a peace on the basis of compromise.

The Reagan program has laid such a basis, though there is no certainty of it. I believe we must not miss the first step if only because there are so many people who envisage the difficulties entailed in the following steps. Difficulties will arise. But it is better to have peace with difficulties, than difficulties that lead to the resumption of military confrontations.●

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF MIDDLEWEIGHT CHAMPIONSHIP FIGHT

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and that of my colleagues to the upcoming 25th anniversary of the greatest moment in the history of central New York sports personalities. Twenty-five years ago, on September 23, 1957, Carmen Basilio, a former onion picker from Chittenango, N.Y., a community I have the honor of representing, won his second world boxing title. On this night in a furious 15-round fight in Yankee Stadium, Carmen took the middleweight championship away from Sugar Ray Robinson. He had previously won the welterweight championship by clawing and scrambling his way up through the ranks. As the New York Times said after the middleweight fight: " * * * Basilio is the toughest little onion picker in the State of New York. He has a chin of iron and determination to match." He was elsewhere described as the "galant warrior from Chittenango."

In recognition of his accomplishments as a fighter, Carmen was named the Professional Athlete of the Year in 1957.

A quarter of a century later, Carmen continues to be a source of pride to central New York. He is an active civic figure in the area he grew up in; he has never forgotten his friends. I salute this determined, classy gentleman on the eve of the anniversary of his great triumph.●

MAX AND MIM BLOOM RECEIVE HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I

inform my colleagues that my good friends, Max and Mim Bloom, are the recipients of the 1982 National Humanitarian Award, presented by the Santa Clara Valley Friends of the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center. The Blooms will be honored at a dinner-dance on October 20.

Max is a fellow San Jose native, a long-time businessman and active participant in community affairs. He has been involved with the Heart Association, the San Jose Light Opera Co., the San Jose Museum of Art, the Symphony Association and the Fine Arts Commission of the city of San Jose. He is also a valued member of the San Jose Rotary Club.

Mim Bloom, a native of Kentucky, met and married Max while he was in the service. Mim is a businesswoman and a vivacious and effective community worker. She has been active in the Cancer Society, the Symphony Association, the Crippled Children Society, the Villa Monte League, the San Jose Opera Guild and the San Jose Museum of Art.

It is a very real pleasure to have a small part in honoring Max and Mim for their many years of service to the people of the Santa Clara Valley. Besides being the kind of people who contribute their time and energy to their community, Max and Mim are delightful people. They are good company and approach life with a sense of humor that is infectious. Most important to me, they are my good friends. It is a joy to have known Max and Mim for these many years. I count their friendship as a very special privilege.●

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. ANTHONY MARICICH OF THE LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to Capt. Anthony Maricich, a hard-working man who will be honored on October 5, 1982, for his service to the Los Angeles-San Pedro community. On June 7, 1982, Captain Maricich retired from the Los Angeles Fire Department after 34 years of dedicated service.

A native-Californian, Anthony moved to San Pedro when he was 11. Upon graduation from San Pedro High School in 1941, Anthony went to work for Western Union. In 1943, heeding the call to serve his Nation, Anthony Maricich joined the merchant marine. He saw action in the Pacific and the Atlantic theaters. On December 1, 1947, Anthony Maricich joined the Los Angeles Fire Department.

When he started, Anthony Maricich manned the hoses that dosed the fires.

As time passed, Anthony's achievements and capabilities were recognized and he was promoted. In 1955, he became an engineer, operating the fire pumps. In 1972, he was promoted to captain.

As a captain, Anthony Maricich's responsibilities increased tremendously. Recognizing that he needed further training, Captain Maricich took, and successfully completed, several officers training courses, including courses at the U.S. Navy Fire Fighting School, the Fire Officers' School, the Tank Vessel Inspectors' School, and the Scuba Fire Fighting School.

Captain Maricich is married to Louise Mary Maricich and they are the proud parents of a lovely daughter: Toni Marie.

Mr. Speaker, in Capt. Anthony Maricich we have an exemplary American: a family man, a man dedicated to the service of his community. I am sure that all Members of Congress would like to join me in congratulating Captain Maricich on his retirement and his remarkable contribution of service.

To Captain Maricich, his wife, Louise, and daughter, Toni Marie, my wife, Lee, and I, extend our warmest best wishes, good health, and personal fulfillment in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO DOUGLAS FRASER, PRESIDENT, UNITED AUTO WORKERS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, September 17 and 18, the men and women who comprise the Congressional Black Caucus will host the 12th annual CBC legislative weekend which will help the caucus formulate legislative issues for the future. In addition to our legislative work, we will also take time as a group to recognize those persons who have made outstanding contributions to our Nation, in general, and to black America specifically.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I want to note that one of those who has worked with us in our program for progress, whom we will salute is Douglas Fraser, the president of the United Auto Workers Union. Mr. Fraser is retiring next year so we wanted to take this occasion of the coming together of the black nation to reflect on his stewardship as a leader in the American labor movement.

In his poem "Adjuration," black poet Charles Enoch Wheeler wrote:

Let those who can endure their doubts speak for the comfort of the weary . . .

In the tradition of his predecessors, Walter P. Reuther and Leonard Woodcock, Doug Fraser is an eloquent spokesman on behalf of the common folk, the working folk, and all Americans who seek to strengthen our country through a strong economy that recognizes the utility of a decent wage for an honest day's work. Not only has Doug Fraser been on the front line in seeking equitable pay and humane conditions in the workplace in which blacks have shared the benefits, he has also been at our side in the campaign to eradicate racism and bigotry from work places and the American labor movement.

Because he has accepted the responsibility to speak for the comfort of the weary without fear in times of worsening economic stagnation, we are proud to say that he is a friend of the Congressional Black Caucus and black America. We wish him and his wife Winifred much success and God's abundant blessings in the many years ahead.

To underscore what I have said above I enclose an informative and useful article about Douglas Fraser which recently appeared in the Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 5, 1982]

FRASER NEARS RETIREMENT AS UAW
GRAPPLES WITH DETROIT'S DOWNTURN
(By Kathy Sawyer)

Douglas A. Fraser, leader of 1.2 million auto workers, stood at the foot of a long, descending escalator at the Atlanta airport, looking up.

"Think we oughta try it?" he asked Joe Loesche, who has been driver-bodyguard-companion for every United Auto Workers president since the late Walter P. Reuther. The two have a running joke about their occasional sprint up a Down escalator, about the funny looks they get, these two crazy silver-haired guys.

To travel around with Fraser for a few days just before Labor Day, it was hard to believe he is 65 and will soon give up his powerful position to retire to some quiet teaching job. And it was easy to forget that he is presiding over the darkest period in the history of his union.

Fraser acts like a guy who enjoys running up life's Down escalators. To many Americans, he is only vaguely familiar from television news as the down-to-earth labor leader who won a seat on the Chrysler board of directors and convinced his membership to make concessions estimated at \$4.5 billion to help a mortally stricken auto industry recover.

Fraser's union has lost over 300,000 members in the past five years and many will never return to the assembly lines. Foreign auto makers have captured 31 percent of the market in the United States for what was once the quintessential American product.

Fraser's retirement, scheduled for next summer, is viewed by many in the labor movement as "the end of an era." He is the last UAW chief to be drawn from the inner circle of Reuther, the Depression leader who forged the union into a potent social and political force.

Fraser, who has been UAW president since 1977, is respected as a gutsy leader

with a gruff, crusty humanity. A high-school dropout who married a university professor, he lives with his wife in a small co-op apartment near downtown Detroit, travels coach with his long legs scrunched up on his briefcase, refuses the fancier cars that come with his job and says nasty things about labor corruption. Open, approachable and good-humored, but with a hair-trigger temper betrayed by a sudden reddening of the face, he draws crowds wherever he goes.

In his recent round of speeches, news conferences, trips to Washington for an AFL-CIO meeting, to Knoxville and Tulsa for union gatherings, and work in his Detroit headquarters, Fraser started to acknowledge the strain of what promises to be a painful leave-taking from the world he entered as a teen-age fender-mender about a half century ago; months and months of sentimental hugs and handshakes and questions.

Some people may worry about pressure, but "I think Doug is worried about how he's going to get along *without* stress and pressure," said his trim, outgoing wife Winifred—"Winnie" to friends—a dean at Wayne State University.

That week, Fraser had much to worry about. The Chrysler negotiations were heating up again. The Canadian UAW was threatening to strike rather than make concessions as its U.S. brothers had—the first major split in the union's international membership. General Dynamics, formerly the Chrysler tank division, was on the verge of potentially violent strike. All were expected to come to a head by mid-September.

Fraser also was getting angrier and angrier about congressional resistance to the union's number one legislative priority: a controversial bill to protect auto industry jobs by requiring foreign auto makers that sell cars in the United States to make the bulk of them here. Fraser blamed the delays on House Commerce Committee Chairman John D. Dingell, the Democrat from Detroit. By the end of the week, he vowed softly, "I don't think I'll ever speak to John Dingell again. He let us down."

Fraser said he gets weariest with all the questions about lazy, greedy workers and why aren't they to blame for the soaring prices and declining quality of cars, inflation-inducing high wages and so on. "It takes two to tango," he said at one point, insisting that managers share the blame with workers and that in any case the situation was not so easy to size up way back in 1979, before the roof fell in.

One night, he reminded a Detroit audience of auto industry managers and suppliers that just two or three short years ago even the Japanese small cars were hard to sell. "And you couldn't give away Vegas or Pintos—first of all they were rotten cars [big laugh]—but the people of the United States really wanted to drive large cars. . . . We had an absolute monopoly, in large cars. . . . So I think there was a tendency to be self-satisfied, complacent. All of this contributed to our downfall."

Another evening, Fraser had a rare, small "victory" to celebrate by sharing a pitcher of light beer with his staff at a neighborhood bar next to the bleak hulk of a shutdown rubber factory, near UAW's Solidarity House. A Reagan administration official, Michael Driggs of the Department of Commerce, had come to Detroit and enraged the community by saying unemployed auto workers weren't as bad off as everybody thought, thanks to their benefits and working wives and so on, and that in fact they had an average income of \$28,000.

Fraser and his young public relations chief, David Mitchell, had thrown together an impromptu news conference at which Fraser, flanked by a couple of black unemployed workers whose benefits had run out, called Driggs a cynical, cruel "bum." The story got a lot of play across the country, at the same time the administration was trying to convince the public it is not insensitive.

Later, with his lopsided grin, Fraser said, "I know Mac Baldrige [Driggs' boss, Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige]. I think I'll give him a call and see if he'll let Driggs out of his cage one more time, see if we can't get him back here again before the election, maybe get him to go to Ohio, and Pennsylvania and some other states, too. . . ."

The "succession thing," Fraser said, as he waited in one of those plastic airport chairs one day, "is starting to bother me."

One of the fears that has caused him some sleepless nights is that, under his successor, the union might abandon its tradition as a progressive social force, he said. There is a belief in some quarters that this was a role UAW leaders could afford to play only as long as times were fat and the rank-and-file was in clover.

Although the membership, as wages improved, has grown more and more conservative and middle class, all of the contenders for Fraser's job express a commitment to what they call the "Reuther legacy," compassion for the poor, support for the causes of women and blacks. But, said Fraser, "it's like anything else. There are shadings, and some are more committed than others."

Fraser, who was born in Scotland, the son of an electrician, has always been an activist, a left-wing Democrat, who counts among his credits the desegregation of a union hall toilet in Memphis as far back as the late 1940s.

It's true, he told a group of black journalists, that many union members resented certain costly social programs. But President Reagan has given them a new perspective. Many are no longer protesting because now "they're on food stamps themselves."

Fraser has refused to say whom he favors as a successor. The decision will be made by UAW's 26-member executive board. The two front runners reportedly are UAW Secretary-Treasurer Raymond Majerus and Vice President Donald Ephlin, with two other vice presidents trailing.

Fraser and his predecessor, Leonard Woodcock, each had 15 years in national union offices to establish themselves, he said. "These poor guys, all of them have only been there for 2½ years, the worst god-damned years in the history of our union, so it's really unfair. . . ."

On a visit to Knoxville, Tenn., Fraser was greeted with the sort of spine-tingling union theater sure to shake up even the most hardened right-to-worker. It was a political "summer school" for union members from all up and down the eastern seaboard and across the South, designed to get out the union vote this fall.

As the regional leader proudly led him into the auditorium, 500 men and women in "Buy American" caps sprang to their feet, raised their clasped hands high over their heads and started to sing along with two union guitarists on the stage. They sang the union anthem, "Solidarity Forever," to the tune of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

"It is we who plowed the prairies, built the cities where they trade . . . Now we stand outcast and starving 'midst the won-

ders we have made . . . But our union makes us strong!"

Fraser talked to them, bluntly about the hard facts of life in the auto industry, but assured them he would grant no further concessions to Chrysler (they cheered).

And he told them goodbye. "This is the last time I will address you as president," he said, and went on to pave the way for the next fellow. The struggles of the '30s and '40s were difficult "physically," he said, but "not nearly as difficult and complex as those of today."

He said he has heard the talk that, because the new crop of leaders was not reared in the Depression, they lack the sense of commitment of Fraser's generation. "I don't accept that. Commitment is an intellectual development."

What his successor can look forward to coping with, besides "enormous pressures," Fraser said later are a smaller but more highly skilled and secure membership, more trimming in the staff of the UAW itself (Fraser has cut 95 people), a fast-changing industry, a continuing need for "flexibility" at the bargaining table. Also, there is the fact that layoffs have gutted a whole younger generation of workers.

He believes the old adversarial spirit will resurface in labor-management relations to some extent when the economic pie expands again. "But what will never, never change again is the so-called democratization of the work place."

Though many unionists miss the the good old days, Fraser said, he prefers the new, better-educated workers who question the union leader, as well as the boss. "When I was a steward, Christ, the people would just do anything I wanted and they didn't even ask me why."

He said this despite the fact he suffered one of his greatest disappointments in the recent General Motors negotiations, when he was unable to sell his membership on an initial agreement and, on a second try, won approval with only 52 percent of the vote.

On Labor Day, Fraser said, he planned to march in a parade in Detroit. "Me and probably about five other guys," he added with a sharp, dry laugh. The workers have other things to do these days, thanks to their union. "They go to their weekend cottages. Their cottages! Me, I still love a Labor Day parade." ●

H.R. 6046—THE EXTRADITION ACT

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the full House may consider in the coming weeks H.R. 6046, the Extradition Act. Extradition law reform is needed to modernize and reform procedures while facilitating the extradition of those charged with serious crimes.

However, I believe it is essential that we include proper safeguards to insure that extradition procedures are not subject to political abuse. I have recently been contacted by the American Civil Liberties Union and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which have raised

serious concerns about H.R. 6046, including provisions that would:

Require the courts to hold an individual for at least 10 days based solely on a request of a foreign government, with no supporting evidence, unless the person can affirmatively demonstrate that he or she should be released;

Prohibit a court from inquiring into allegations that a State is seeking extradition of a person for the purpose of prosecuting such person because of his or her political opinions, race, religion, or nationality;

Define the long-standing political crime exception to extradition so narrowly as to exclude in almost all circumstances crimes which in any way include violent conduct—even in cases in which a person used violence to escape from a foreign prison where he was being tortured.

I think these are very serious concerns that deserve the fullest scrutiny and debate on the floor of the House. My colleague, GEORGE CROCKETT and others have prepared a series of amendments to H.R. 6046 to address the problems listed above.

Our Nation's extradition laws say a lot to other countries about our commitment to freedom, human rights, and the administration of justice. It is essential that we send the right message abroad and, at the same time, preserve the civil liberties of persons within our legal jurisdiction. It is for these reasons I believe this matter must be fully debated and discussed if it should come to the floor of the House. ●

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GENERAL VON STEUBEN

HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, September 17 is the anniversary of the birth of one of our country's most important Revolutionary War patriots, Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben. This native of Prussia volunteered his services to Gen. George Washington, and arrived at Valley Forge in February 1778. He brought his military expertise to an army that was cold, hungry, and ill-clad after a rough winter, and inspired in our early patriots a great sense of discipline. For this, he is properly called "the first teacher of the American army." Without his services, our revolutionary fight would have been much more difficult. Along with German-Americans who have lent us such great cultural, scientific, and economic accomplishments, I wish to commemorate General von Steuben's outstanding service in helping to found our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is another person of German descent born on this date to whom this American is most certainly grateful: Mary Melissa Gansel Nelligan, my mother. Happy birthday, Mom! ●

CONTRACT SANCTITY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced a bill to guarantee the sanctity of farm product export contracts. Today, many of the world's grain firms are reluctant to enter into contracts with the Soviet Union because they have no assurance that the U.S. Government will allow them to deliver products in excess of the 8 million tons guaranteed by the United States-Soviet grains agreement.

As I indicated last week, farm groups strongly support this legislation. In late July, the Senate Banking Subcommittee on International Finance and Monetary Policy held hearings on this issue. In that hearing, Charles E. Hamon, president of the American Soybean Association, said:

We all know how disastrous the 1980 Soviet embargo has been to American agriculture. In 1979, the Soviets were our fifth largest soybean market purchasing almost 2 million metric tons of soybeans and soybean products.

This year, our sales to the Soviets are only 700,000 metric tons, about one-third of the pre-embargo level. Our competitors in Brazil and Argentina are supplying the remainder of the Soviets' soybean needs, and we see little chance U.S. soybean and soybean product exports will reach their pre-embargo level in the near future.

Short of a U.S. policy to never impose an export embargo in the future, ASA believes the best alternative is for the Congress to adopt legislation forbidding the President from canceling previously reported outstanding commercial export contracts for agricultural commodities, except under the most dire circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, no one has worked harder to see this become law than the ASA affiliate in my own State, the Land of Lincoln Soybean Association. In testimony before the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Wheat, Soybeans, and Feed Grains in a field hearing in Springfield, Ill., last May, Jerry Gates, president of the association, said:

The integrity of the United States as a reliable supplier of farm products has been undermined as a result of at least four major grain embargoes since 1973.

The Land of Lincoln Soybean Association feels it is essential that the U.S. Government quickly establish a policy to honor the sanctity of export contracts. Such a policy declaration would immediately improve our international image as an exporting Nation and open the way for increased foreign sales. These potential increased sales are

needed to both help regain lost sales from previous buyers and to expand foreign markets further. Farm profitability shall be positively affected when export guarantee legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gates will be in Washington next week to press the case for this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to heed his message. With farm income projected to be well below normal, this country simply cannot afford to ignore its reputation as a reliable supplier. We cannot afford to forget that agriculture is the backbone of the Nation. Thank you.●

SOVIET JEWS DENIED VISAS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today in the Soviet Union there are hundreds of thousands of Jews who have applied for exit visas, and who have been refused these visas. At the same time they are being persecuted because of their desire to emigrate.

Aleksandr Yampolski is one of these refuseniks. After making known his desire to leave Russia and settle in Israel he lost his job as an electronic engineer and has been forced to labor as a janitor in Leningrad's Kirov Sports Stadium.

The "official" reason for the Government's refusal to allow Aleksandr Yampolski to have an exit visa involves security considerations. But he has not worked in his field of electronics for 8 years since he first made his application and any knowledge he may have retained must certainly be obsolete now.

There is, therefore, no real reason for the Soviet Union to keep Aleksandr Yampolski under its control and to deny him the freedom to go to Israel. I therefore call on the leaders in the Kremlin to allow him, and the thousands like him, to leave the country. At the same time I appeal to him not to lose heart and abandon his quest for freedom because there are thousands of us in the free world who support him in the desire to live in the country of his choice.●

JOBS BILL FLAWED

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the so-called jobs bill today. I am in full agreement that bold action is needed to help put America's 10 million unemployed workers back to work, but the program proposed in this bill is fatally flawed. It simply will

not work. It will amount to nothing more than a symbol. And \$1 billion is too high a price tag for mere symbolism.

What is worse, this bill holds out a false hope to unemployed citizens and gives only lip service to a devastating problem that continues to grow.

I hope we have not forgotten the lesson of the Gramm-Latta/Reagan budget fiasco last year: Good legislation is not made in 1 day—or in 1 week. A budget drafted by David Stockman in the wee hours of the morning last summer, and passed with very little debate, created problems that we are still trying to correct. Let us not make the same mistake again.

As I said, this bill is fatally flawed. Let me point out some of the practical problems.

First, this appropriation would be spent by localities in the next 2 months, by December 31, 1982, to pay for road repair, bridges, rebuilding and repairing facilities, and other public projects. Mr. Speaker, any worker in the Frost Belt knows that you cannot build roads, paint bridges, or repair buildings in the cold of winter. It does not work. You get frozen paintbrushes, crumbling asphalt, and a lot of cold, wet mud.

Next, even if winter were miraculously delayed for 2 months, the program still would not work because it provides no funding for materials. This bill is based on the premise that there are severely depressed communities that are falling apart and need urgent help. Does it help to give them a payroll but no materials? And to expect them to come up with the materials in 2 months? It is obvious that we are creating an impossible situation.

And finally, even if winter were miraculously delayed and seriously depressed communities found bonanzas of unused, already-collected revenues to pay for materials, the program still would not help. The numbers tell the tale: Ten million Americans are out of work; the bill provides—at best—200,000 new jobs; and the net result is a net reduction in total unemployment of about two-tenths of 1 percent (and putting only about 2 percent of the unemployed back to work).

I share with my colleagues a deep concern for the unemployed and their families and I am frustrated by our inability to solve our economic problems. And I share their concern for our deteriorating infrastructure of road and other public facilities on which future commerce depends. But in my heart, I cannot support spending \$1 billion on a program that is doomed to failure.●

DORIS AND ALLISTER MacKAY— 50 YEARS OF COMMITMENT

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, Representatives of Congress often have occasion to meet with constituents whose civic efforts add a rich and textured quality to community life. Two such constituents of mine are Doris and Allister MacKay.

Residents of Winchester, the MacKays represent the New England spirit of community involvement, civic responsibility and good old-fashioned respect and reverence for American traditions and values. Al and Doris MacKay, who will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary on September 24, have made a personal and lasting commitment to each other and to their family that is matched only by their commitment to the community in which they live. In 1943, Allister MacKay became a member of the New England Deaconess Association, and became its president in 1952. During those years, the number of residents in the association's facilities increased from 24 to 300; its budget increased from \$60,000 to \$2 million yearly; and the range of its services expanded many fold. The association's services now include three retirement homes, one long-term facility, and apartments for the retired.

In addition to his many years as vice president of the First National Bank of Boston and his involvement in the New England Deaconess' many programs, Mr. MacKay has also been active in the First Methodist Church, Medford, Mass., and more recently in the Crawford Memorial United Methodist Church, Winchester, Mass. He has served as chairperson of the board of trustees; chairperson of the pastoral relations committee; member of the board of stewards; and Sunday school superintendent.

Mr. MacKay has also served as a member of the board of trustees of the Preachers' Aid Society. He has been chairperson of the finance commission and then treasurer of the Morgan Memorial, Boston, Mass.

In 1975, the Health and Welfare Ministries Division of the Board of Global Ministries conferred its highest honor on Al MacKay when it named him to the Hall of Fame in Philanthropy in Philadelphia.

Doris MacKay has worked beside her husband in his many church and civic activities. For the 50 years of their marriage, Doris MacKay has provided a supportive environment for her husband and family. An active member of the Winchester Garden Club, Doris MacKay has raised two

sons, both New Englanders: Gordon MacKay, a senior vice president at New England Life Insurance Co. of Boston and R. Bruce MacKay, chairman of the social studies department of Berlin High School in New Hampshire. Doris has also lavished her love and abiding attention on her four fine grandchildren.

The MacKays have raised a family that shares their sense of strong civic pride and their interest in good work and community involvement.

It is fitting to recognize the MacKays relatively quiet but exceptional achievements on their golden wedding anniversary. They have forged and maintained a relationship of respect, mutual understanding, caring, love, trust and personal growth that should be the bedrock of American family life. In addition, they have shared their gifts of permanence and giving with the people in their community. We are all the richer for that and I would like to acknowledge their personal and civic achievements on this, their 50th and golden wedding anniversary. ●

CORPORATE CANNIBALISM IS HURTING INNOVATION

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, the current takeover battle involving United Technologies Corp., Martin Marietta Corp., and Bendix Corp. has dominated the business news for much of the past month. Undoubtedly, a great deal of high-level planning went into designing the game plans for these takeover participants. And, I am sure that we can look forward to at least a few more weeks of tender offers and legal battles among these three corporate giants.

All this leads me to wonder, who is minding the store? It would appear that the customers that do business with these three companies have to seriously ask how efficiently their needs are being met when so much of the time and energy of the top management of Martin Marietta, United Technologies, and Bendix is spent concentrating on the "golden parachutes," tender offers, stock swaps, antitrust guidelines, and tax recaptures attendant to the proposed takeover attempts.

All three of these companies are major contractors to the Federal Government, especially in the vital areas of space technology and national defense. All three companies do business for the American taxpayer that collectively runs into the billions of dollars each year. Therefore, it is troubling to me that these companies are diverting

so much of their top management's time and effort away from their primary tasks and directing them instead to the corporate equivalent of a feeding frenzy.

One company, Bendix, last week called a meeting of its board of directors. The most pressing business on the meeting schedule was not how the company could best serve its customers, including the U.S. Government, from which Bendix annually collects about \$1.1 billion in contract sales. No; they spent their time considering how to design the best "golden parachute." A golden parachute, for those who are not familiar with the new language of the merger makers, is an employment contract that protects a company's top executives by guaranteeing their jobs and financial security in the event of a hostile takeover.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our economy is in such deep trouble, I have to ask if our society's interests are well served by our corporate leaders spending so much vital human and capital resources on such unproductive and wasteful behavior. And, as a major client to these three companies, our Government has to take a close look at suppliers who spend more time on the phone with investment bankers than they do with their production staffs.

I know of few small businesspeople who can afford to go on a month-long shopping spree and leave their stores in the hands of employees who are not even sure if the owners are coming back. Their customers would not stand for it.

At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD an excellent article by economics writer Robert Samuelson that appeared in the Washington Post on September 14. He discusses the effect of megamergers, especially the Bendix-United Technologies-Martin Marietta merger, on our national productivity. I recommend it to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1982]

CORPORATE CANNIBALISM MAY HURT INNOVATION

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Perhaps the most striking thing about the struggle by Bendix Corp., Martin Marietta Corp. and United Technologies Corp. over who will swallow whom—or whether anyone will swallow anyone—is that it seems so routine. Megamergers are so frequent that they no longer startle.

The genuinely intriguing question about this corporate cannibalism is whether the quest for survival and growth compromises overall economic creativity. The economy derives much of its strength from its capacity to innovate. But many modern mergers are the antithesis of innovation and, at the same time, an attempt to accommodate it.

Innovation in this context does not mean exclusively, or even primarily, invention or discovery. It means the conversion of technical advances (including advances in management and marketing) into commercially

useful products. This is something at which big companies do not necessarily excel.

Economist Joseph Schumpeter long ago observed that innovation is initially a destructive process. It threatens markets for existing products and the companies, plants and workers serving those markets. Consequently, what is called innovation at many firms consists primarily of important—but derivative—improvements of existing technologies and products.

Major innovations often have originated outside existing industries. Horse and buggy companies generally did not become major automobile firms. Traditional office machine firms didn't perfect rapid photocopying; a newcomer, Xerox Corp., did that. Although the basic technology was no secret, oldline electronics firms—RCA Corp., General Electric Co.—didn't pioneer integrated circuits (electronic "chips").

Bendix typifies the path toward giantism followed by many American companies. Vincent Bendix, the founder, started his first auto company in 1907. It was one of 94 new automakers that year and one that didn't survive. His first big break came in 1913, when he designed an automatic engine starter; by 1919, production had reached 1.5 million.

Bendix was the classic entrepreneur; that is, he was almost a compulsive gambler. His company never made the automatic washing machine that bore his name. But Bendix reached the inventors and lent them laboratory space and his name. Bendix's company ultimately outgrew his personality. Heavy real estate losses forced him into personal bankruptcy in 1939. When he died in 1945, he no longer was associated with the firm.

Now his namesake is a sprawling enterprise (1981 sales: \$4.4 billion) engaged in electronics, machine tools and auto parts. Chairman William Agee, 44, has a reputation for being brash, outspoken, self-confident and, so far, successful. He aims to reduce Bendix's dependence on auto parts—clearly a mature market—and emphasize high technology.

Agee has operated Bendix like a multi-billion-dollar jigsaw puzzle. By selling parts of the company, he raised more than \$500 million, which, while interest rates were high, was invested in high-yielding securities. The \$1.7 billion bid for Martin Marietta (1981 sales: \$3.3 billion) represents an effort to expand Bendix's aerospace business. Martin Marietta is the prime contractor for the MX missile.

Bendix's history underlines the problem of the large modern corporation. As firms grow, they acquire distinct institutional interests: namely, self-preservation and growth. At the same time, they see the initial source of their growth fade while they face new outside threats.

Most companies cannot prevent shifts in technology or tastes. Eight of the original top 20 firms of the 1955 Fortune magazine list of the 500 largest industrial corporations in terms of sales have dropped in the rankings or disappeared. Among the missing: Bethlehem Steel Corp., Chrysler Corp. and Swift & Co. The modern corporation either adapts or decays.

The vague response to this is "strategic planning." Roughly speaking, this means examining your company, deciding where it ought to go and devising a plan to get there. This is the game Agee tried to play. Mergers, acquisitions and divestitures are standard tactics. In the first half of 1982, there were 1,198 of them, worth nearly \$28 billion,

according to W.T. Grimm & Co. About one-third were divestitures.

The attraction of mergers is that they look easier and safer than starting businesses from scratch. A study by Ralph Biggadike of the University of Virginia reviewed ventures started by 200 of the Fortune 500 and found that, on average, it took eight years for new units to attain a positive cash flow. Acquiring a firm seems to promise faster and fatter profits.

Does this maximize innovation for society as a whole? In some ways, the answer is yes. As Bendix's history indicates, many entrepreneurs lack the temperament or intellect to oversee the expanded organizations needed to exploit their innovations. Acquisitions also can spread innovations. Thus General Electric is committed to the electronically controlled "factory of the future." Fulfilling the commitments, though, has meant acquiring small firms that make chips and specialize in computer-aided design and manufacture.

But the other side of the story is this: Management of big companies becomes increasingly abstract, divorced from intimate familiarity with its component parts; planning becomes a game with its own realities. Top executives and directors grow remote from the firms they're buying or the divisions they're managing. Their decisions increasingly reflect consultants' studies, personal power lust or financial fads.

Some years ago, the fad was diversification into many industries to neutralize fluctuations in any of them. Now, The Wharton Magazine of the University of Pennsylvania reports that companies with the greatest product diversity have the lowest profit rates. More recent, the fad was to buy natural-resource firms as a hedge against inflation. In a deflationary world, this looks increasingly suspect.

The Bendix brawl has precious little to do with innovation. The dilemma of a mature economy is that investment decisions are dominated by mature corporations, that may have a conservative bias. Doing big things to keep themselves big, they may ignore the small things that start tomorrow's industries. ●

PROTECTING THE UNEMPLOYED AND WORKING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, high unemployment is one of the most pressing problems facing our Nation. It is the topic of conversation in board rooms and at dinner tables everywhere as newspaper headlines document the gloomy statistics.

Nationwide, the unemployment rate was 9.8 percent in August. In Illinois it was 11.8 percent in August, a drop from 12.3 percent in July, but still leaving much room for improvement.

The battle against unemployment has to be fought on two fronts. In the short run, we must cushion the financial impact unemployment has on families of laid-off workers. In the long term, we have to restore the strength

of the economy which provides people with productive jobs, for which no financial compensation can substitute.

Steps have been taken in Congress to accomplish these goals. As a result of a provision in the tax bill passed August 19, starting next week the Federal Government will provide an extension of benefits from 6 to 10 weeks, depending on the State. Workers in Illinois will be eligible for the full 10 weeks.

This action, which I supported, was necessary to prevent about 50,000 Illinois jobless from losing financial support.

These additional benefits will be made available to the unemployed worker after he has received up to 39 weeks of benefits from the State and Federal Government combined.

I have cosponsored pending legislation aimed at relieving the strain that unemployment has placed on family finances and State budgets. One aspect of the bill sets up regions to which additional extended benefits would be targeted. The targeted areas would be locations where high unemployment continues, even if the State's overall economy has improved.

Another piece of pending legislation waives Federal interest charges for States where the unemployment rate has been high for extended periods. This would be a great help to Illinois, where the unemployment compensation fund is \$1.7 billion in debt to the Federal Government.

However, unemployment benefits only provide temporary relief, they are no substitute for a job.

Steps are also being taken to address the needs of the unskilled and chronically unemployed. The House passed last month, with my support, a bill to establish a workable partnership between government and the private sector to provide job training and employment to those in need. Called the Job Training and Partnership Act, it is intended to replace the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), which expires next month.

I believe this program promises to be far more cost effective than CETA because it allows the business community a greater role in determining how participants are trained and what they are trained for.

The Senate has passed its own version of a job training bill and the differences between the two programs will be resolved in conference committee next month. However, those two bills share a feature crucial to success: Emphasis on training people for jobs in the private sector—jobs with a future—rather than on creating costly and unproductive make-work.

I am hopeful that these programs, in conjunction with what appears to be the start of a long awaited economic recovery, can restore the American people's faith in our country as the

land of opportunity. It is that faith that has provided America with its greatest natural resource—the initiative, the energy and the integrity of the American worker.

TRIBUTE TO HALF A CENTURY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a woman who has devoted nearly half a century of service to her community in New York City. The leadership and guidance Mrs. Celine G. Marcus provided the Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association (LHNA) as executive director for 12 years will indeed be missed when she retires this month.

It was a great pleasure for me to have had the opportunity to work with her in the community. Mrs. Marcus, who joined LHNA in 1959, served as assistant and associate executive director before assuming her present post in 1970. A graduate of Barnard College in the field of social services, she has worked continuously on programs that would improve the quality of life in the community.

Through her direction and innovative ideas the LHNA has grown and developed a wide variety of programs to handle local needs. For the elderly, several programs were established including a comprehensive senior citizen center, an outreach program to the homebound, and the Caring Neighbor, a program that provides round-the-clock home attendant services for elderly and handicapped persons.

Programs for the youth of the community were also developed to include job development and vocational guidance services for local teenagers, urban and rural environmental education for school district No. 2 students, year-round camping at Lenox Hill Camp in Connecticut, and youth involvement in service projects for older persons. Mrs. Marcus and the association worked to expand self-help efforts in the community stressing local anticrime initiatives, block and tenant associations, and community recreation leagues.

Mrs. Marcus, apart from her service to LHNA, was instrumental in the founding of Stanley M. Isaacs Neighborhood Center, Interfaith Neighbors, Volunteer Services to the Elderly of Yorkville, and the Yorkville Emergency Alliance. In conjunction with her years at the association, she was actively serving on the boards of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Community Board No. 8, the Yorkville Civic Council, United Neighborhood Houses, and the New York State

Association of Settlement Houses, among others to numerous to list.

I take pride in paying tribute to someone so dedicated to service for the benefit of the community and wish Mrs. Marcus well in her future endeavors which, undoubtedly, will involve service for the betterment of our neighborhoods. ●

KEITH SEBELIUS

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1982

● Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I remember well the first time I met Keith Sebelius. As a new Member of Congress representing the big First District in Kansas, the Committee on Agriculture was a natural for him. He requested assignment to the committee and received it because of his experience and knowledge in agriculture. We sat next to each other in the committee for 2 years. Because of our seating arrangements I learned to know Keith very early in his distinguished service in the Congress.

Keith had a quality that many people wish they had. He had the ability to see beyond the surface of issues to the far-reaching impact that amendments on legislation we were considering might have. Never, did he lose his temper or back down when he believed he was right. Most often, he was right and those of us who learned to know him, learned to seek his counsel.

We were saddened when he announced in 1980 that he would not seek reelection. I called him a number of times after he returned to his home in Kansas. Many of us still sought his advice. When we learned of his physical problem, we remembered him in our prayers.

The First District of Kansas, his native Kansas, the Congress, and the Nation, has lost a great friend. Carol and I extend our sympathy and our prayers to his wife Betti and his family.

Thanks for sharing Keith with us those years. ●

ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT ON
THE POPE

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a couple of articles regarding the assassination attempt on the Pope into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and encourage them to read them.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 3, 1982]

BULGARIA AND THE ATTACK ON THE POPE

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

The problem with modern life is that something hits you at a particular time but you have no direct way to react to it. You can fess or oh and ah but then your anger or delight dissipates and you are left feeling, if you remember to feel anything, at all, that you have responded inadequately and are the worse for it. It is the disconnect syndrome.

So it was that I read in a vacation-place newspaper last month a brief report on Claire Sterling's investigation of the May 1981 shooting of Pope John Paul II by one Mehmet Ali Agca, since sentenced to life by a Rome court. The thrust of it was that the Bulgarian secret service, which does nothing except on the instructions of the Soviet KGB, had set up a young Turkish terrorist to assassinate the Polish-born prelate for being the spiritual father of Poland's Solidarity movement.

Since I admire Claire Sterling's work on uncovering the facts of international terrorism and since I do not put anything past the Kremlin, I was inclined to believe that brief report on her Reader's Digest investigation. Meanwhile, however, I boiled at the thought of the lousy, slavish Bulgarians doing Moscow's truly dirty work for it. But it was vacation time and, soon, time for tennis, for the sweet hush of sunset in Vermont. Who could maintain a rage against Bulgaria?

Only back in Washington was it possible to read the full Sterling text. What needs to be said is that it demolishes virtually any possibility that Agca was simply a nut, either right-wing or left-wing, or that he was somehow the typical product of a turbulent, avenging Islamic fundamentalist wave.

He was an international terrorist, a low-born student recruited at university and trained in Beirut who escaped from a Turkish military prison while on trial for killing an editor and took sanctuary for 50 days in Bulgaria before returning to Europe, where he spent some \$50,000 in cash living the high life before shooting the pope. In Sofia, Agca had met two men who provided him with the requisite passport and assassination pistol. They are associates of a Turk long used by the Bulgarian secret service to run guns to the terrorists (of all stripes) who almost destroyed Turkey in the 1970s.

As always in these matters, Sterling's account is factual, documented, unattributed and circumstantial in turn. I found her making of the case judicious and her suggested conclusions at the very least plausible. She convinced me it is highly probable the Bulgarians, which is to say the Soviets, contrived "The Plot to Murder the Pope."

The very idea of a state's undertaking to arrange a crime of this boldness is unthinkable to many people, either preposterous at face and in any event beyond courtroom proof or evidence in itself of a hostile political intent on the part of the person raising the question. It takes an imaginative leap or, perhaps better, a realistic leap to contemplate it, unless you come at it from the point of view of the weary cynic who has seen and who excuses everything.

Once you are ready to contemplate the idea, there is the further difficulty of accepting its implications. How is one to deal with a government that may have ordered up or encouraged such a monstrous crime? What might a government that would do that not do?

September 16, 1982

In respect to the Soviet Union, perhaps there should be and can be no special response—beyond the airing of the charge. Either you reject it or you credit it, in which case you probably see it as confirmation of something very ugly that you already knew. Your reaction feeds into everything else.

In respect to Bulgaria, however, things are a bit different—and here I come to my Vermont impulse to connect, to act on the anger stirred by reading that the Bulgarians were into murdering popes. Not many of us know much about Bulgaria or have a Bulgaria policy. I was in that category until last Wednesday, when I saw in The New York Times a full-page ad peddling Bulgarian wine.

"Bulgaria," the ad copy said, "is the fifth leading exporter of wine in the world. And for good reasons."

And I thought: Bulgaria is the fifth (or whatever it is) leading exporter of terrorism in the world. And for bad reasons. You may wish to buy their "smooth and elegant" Trakia Merlot (catch the name), "a Monsieur Henri selection with the modest price of less than \$3 a bottle." Please do not ask me to share a glass.

DOCUMENTARY BY JIM ANDERSON

WASHINGTON (UPI).—The Soviet Union may have been behind the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II last year because the pontiff threatened to go to Poland to defend the Solidarity Union movement, a network documentary reports.

The NBC documentary, "The Man Who Shot the Pope, a Study in Terrorism," to be broadcast next Tuesday, lays out a chain of circumstantial evidence and allegations by Vatican and Western intelligence sources to conclude:

"The evidence suggests the possibility that the Russians watched the plot against the Pope, or, at a minimum, knew about the plot and did nothing to stop it."

The documentary's narrator, correspondent Marvin Kalb, said, however, "a Soviet connection is strongly suggested, but it cannot be proved."

NBC quotes Vatican sources as saying the Polish-born Pope sent a secret emissary to the Soviet Union at the time of the rise of the Solidarity labor movement in Poland with a letter to President Leonid Brezhnev.

According to NBC, John Paul's letter said "If the Russians moved against Poland, he would lay down the crown of St. Peter and return to his homeland to stand shoulder to shoulder with his people."

The documentary says this persuaded the Soviets "to gamble on coexistence with Solidarity rather than run the risk of an open confrontation with the Pope."

But when Solidarity became stronger, and more independent, the Russians became desperate and decided to strike at the principal international support behind the Polish freedom movement, the Pope.

Cardinal Silvio Oddi of the Vatican, interviewed in the program, says of the attempted assassination, "Who is interested in this affair? A private person is not interested unless he's a fool. And this man (the attempted assassin, Mehmet Ali Agca), he was not a fool. That's proved. He's a killer, really, a professional. So, he was certainly acting in the name of others."

The Pope was shot May 13, 1981, as he rode through St. Peter's Square in an open vehicle. Agca was immediately arrested, con-

victed July 22 after a 2-day trial, and sentenced to life in prison.

John Paul spent 2½ months in the hospital recovering from three bullet wounds from a 9mm pistol, one in the hand, another in the arm, and third in the abdomen. Part of his large intestine was removed.

The NBC program, shown to a preview audience Tuesday, follows a complicated chain of links between Agca and the Bulgarian secret police and the Kremlin.

The links, described as characteristic of complex espionage operations, run from Agca to the Turkish neo-fascist "Gray Wolf" organization, to the Turkish mafia, which runs drugs and guns to Bulgaria, to the Bulgarian Secret Service, to the Soviet KGB.

The strongest evidence comes from the financial trail left by Agca, ostensibly a 23-year-old student and escaped prisoner, who had access to some \$50,000 between the time he broke out of jail in Turkey in November 1979 up to the time he shot the Pope.●

TRIBUTE TO A DEDICATED CITIZEN, GEORGE JOHANSSON

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinctions of Nassau County, N.Y., part of which I have the honor to represent, is that it has more volunteer firefighters than any other county in the United States.

I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding record of service of one of those Nassau County volunteers, George Johanssen. His devotion to duty exemplifies the work of the dedicated volunteer firefighters, whose selfless efforts benefit their fellow citizens, their communities and our great Nation.

Mr. Johanssen is now observing his 50th year as an active volunteer firefighter with the Wantagh, N.Y., Fire Department. For half a century, Mr. Johanssen has responded faithfully to the calls of assistance from residents of the Wantagh community.

To honor this amazing record of service, Mr. Johanssen's friends and neighbors are planning a celebration for him at the Wantagh Fire Department Headquarters on October 9. I know that my colleagues will wish to share in this tribute to a most remarkable man.

During his half-century as a volunteer firefighter, Mr. Johanssen has seen great changes in the Wantagh Fire Department, as his community has grown from a small rural village to a thriving suburban community. Its growth reflects the tremendous commercial and residential development in Nassau County over the past five decades.

During his 50 years with the Wantagh Fire Department, Mr. Johanssen has served in many capacities. He has been a lieutenant and a captain, and

for 15 years was chief chauffeur of the department. In that capacity he supervised the training of Wantagh firefighters in driving the various pieces of fire equipment, operating the pumping equipment on the rigs, and in other training activities. He has responded to thousands of fire and rescue calls, and demonstrated courage and leadership qualities of the highest kind.

Mr. Johanssen is a life-long resident of Long Island. He was born and raised on his family's vegetable farm in Queens County, near the present LaGuardia Airport. In 1925, his father moved the family to the Hunt Farm on Wantagh Avenue, near its present intersection with Hunt Road, and Mr. Johanssen has lived in the community ever since.

The changes he has seen in the Wantagh community and in the fire department are only a small part of the changes that have taken place in every phase of American life in the decades since his birth.

But sweeping as those changes have been, Mr. Johanssen has never swerved from his devotion to the principles of service to his fellow citizens and neighbors, and to his community. Through all of those decades, he has done his very best to be of assistance when assistance is needed. His service is in the highest traditions of good citizenship. Such individual efforts and dedication have helped to build our country and have made it the envy of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I salute George Johanssen for his outstanding public service. His dedication to his community deserves the highest commendation. I know that every one of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives joins me in offering our sincerest congratulations and our best wishes to this exemplary citizen.●

THE NEED FOR LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS TO UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today, we consider the urgent supplemental appropriation for jobs bill (H.J. Res. 562), an important attempt to put the unemployed back to work. This bill will employ 200,000 jobless Americans for up to 6 months in a variety of community service projects, including repairing and rebuilding our bridges, roads, and water systems. Funds under this bill will be targeted to areas with the highest unemployment rate, and priority will be given to those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

The benefits of the urgent supplemental appropriation for jobs bill are

twofold. On the one hand, it would put the unemployed back to work. At the same time, it would enable economically troubled communities to undertake badly needed public service projects. I do not think that we can afford to vote against this measure.

However, I want to caution my colleagues that in singing the praises of this legislation, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is a band-aid approach to our unemployment problems. Most of the public service jobs which are provided under this bill will not lead to permanent employment because there is an essential ingredient missing in this legislation—the private sector. Only by forging a public-private partnership can we hope to put this country back to work.

Fortunately, both the House and Senate have approved comprehensive employment and training measures in which the private sector is an essential ingredient. As I indicated in my testimony at the March hearings which culminated in this employment legislation, of all the lessons to be learned from the CETA program, "I think that the most important is the need to involve the private sector in Federal jobs programs." The House and Senate jobs legislation, which is collectively known as the Training for Jobs Act, is currently pending before a conference committee. Both the House and Senate measures give private industry councils, which are made up of business and industry leaders, an equal voice with local officials in determining how Federal job training funds should be spent. This type of private sector involvement is essential if we are going to place the unemployed in unsubsidized jobs. While I support House Joint Resolution 562, I urge my colleagues to turn away from stopgap approaches to unemployment and concentrate their efforts on long-term solutions such as the "Training for Jobs Act."●

MAKING OCTOBER 1982 NATIONAL SPINAL CORD INJURY MONTH

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution designating October 1982 as "National Spinal Cord Injury Month." I hope that my colleagues will join me seeking prompt House approval of this bill.

Spinal cord injury and paralysis are conditions that could happen to any of us at any time. In the next 24 hours, spinal cord injuries will paralyze another 68 Americans. It just happens. And once it happens, it is devastating.

In the words of one mother of a spinal-cord-injured son:

It's more than just being stuck in a wheelchair. It's an on-going, life-threatening, painful trauma, an insatiable consumer of energy, time and psychological strength. The emotional hurt is relentless—and it gets harder, not easier.

Spinal cord injury exacts tragic and painful emotional costs. And it may also be the single most expensive medical problem in the country today. The same mother, Louise McKnew, head of the National Spinal Cord Injury Association, described her family's costs in this way:

Were my son to spend the rest of his life paralyzed, it would cost anywhere from \$1 to \$5 million. His initial hospitalization averaged \$1,000 a day, the rehabilitation hospital cost \$7,000 a month, the surgeon's fee for his first operation cost \$2,500—and the expenses continue:

A modified van which he drives cost \$25,000.

The house addition and modification cost \$30,000.

Aides total \$9,000 a year.

Physical therapy is \$54 an hour.

Leg bags are \$128 each.

Wheelchair batteries cost \$84 each.

And that's just a sample.

Medical deductions filed with my income tax for 1978, the year he spent in the hospital, totaled \$14,872. These were expenses not covered by high option Blue Cross-Blue Shield insurance. This past year they were \$24,226. The indirect costs are also high: Yale University invested over \$170,000 in architectural modifications for Donny's freshman year—he was their first undergraduate to come in a wheelchair. The total continues to climb, and so does my debt.

For the Federal Government, the annual costs for the support and care of spinal-cord-injured persons is approximately \$3 billion. There is another \$3 billion in private expenditures. And these costs are rising rapidly, as antibiotics keep those with spinal cord injuries alive longer.

In good conscience, we must direct more resources to the needs of those faced with spinal cord injury. We must do more on research for a cure, on medical care, and on rehabilitation programs, housing, and education, and training opportunities.

Most people have no way to be aware of the trauma involved and the staggering costs faced by victims of spinal cord injury and their families. To focus public attention on the need to address this critical health care problem and the need to find a cure, we propose that Congress designate October as National Spinal Cord Injury Month. A number of States have already taken this step. It is the least we can do.

Out of greater awareness may come much future progress.

This small step can serve as an impetus to accelerate research and to increase public support for programs to help the 500,000 spinal cord injured Americans today.

I hope my colleagues will join me and cosponsor this effort.●

HOW ABOUT RADIO HAVANA?

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, the absurdity of spending the \$7½ million (or \$10 million, which the cost may be eventually) to build Radio Marti is captured in a recent editorial by Rick Morain, the editor of the Jefferson Herald in Jefferson, Iowa. Congress should put an end to this nonsense for once and for all and get down to the serious business of negotiating with Castro to put an end to these "radio wars" before they become "shooting wars." I commend the editorial to my colleagues.

[From the Jefferson (Iowa) Herald, Aug. 12, 1982]

HOW ABOUT RADIO HAVANA?

It appears that Congress is giving its approval to the administration's plan to spend \$7½ million for a government-operated radio station to beam news and propaganda from the U.S. to Cuba. It also appears that the Cuban people will never hear the station: Castro has promised to jam the transmission with a 500,000 radio transmission of his own.

The battle of the airways would knock WHO Radio off the air everywhere except for a small area within 45 miles or so of Des Moines. Greene county might or might not be able to pick up WHO broadcasts. The new U.S. station, to be called "Radio Marti", would broadcast on 1040 kh, the same frequency as WHO's 50,000 watt clear-channel station. When Castro jams Radio Marti, he will also jam the Des Moines station.

We were pleased to see that all six U.S. Representatives from Iowa worked against the wild-eyed Radio Marti proposal, although their efforts proved unsuccessful. The government's about to spend \$7½ million for a radio station that the Cuban people will never hear, and Iowans will lose the WHO signal in the bargain.

But it won't be a total loss. If Castro can beam 500,000 watts of power to the United States, it seems reasonable that we in Iowa will be able to pick up his station's signal. After all, WHO goes coast-to-coast and border-to-border with just 50,000 watts. Think of what we'll hear:

Havana talk-radio, with citizen comment on local Cuban candidates, the pros and cons of evolution, and welfare cheaters in Santiago.

Ag programs on the prospects for this year's sugar cane crop, the possibilities of sugar-cane gasohol, and comments about the National Sugar Cane Expo.

The latest hurricane warnings from the entire Caribbean area.

And finally, and most important, Havana's counter to Jim Zabel, with statistics, prospects, coaches' interviews, recruiting accomplishments and play-by-play of the University of Havana Redeyes soccer team.

Maybe Castro will add an English-language overlay to the Spanish for us, the way French and English are both broadcast in Montreal and Quebec. And who knows—

maybe some obscure broadcaster at the Havana station will catch the eye of the Cuban entertainment industry and go on to stardom, and from there to politics, rising eventually to succeed Castro himself.

Nah—no chance.●

SOME SPENDING CUTS ARE STUPID

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, the Lake County News Herald recently published an editorial opposing the Reagan administration's foolish and thoughtless proposal to scale back the Nation's waste water treatment program. Clearly, this proposal is anti-clean water, anti-environment and as the editorial states succinctly "one example of Government economy that is ill advised and stupid."

This Congress should not sound any retreat on any program that is proving to be successful. Any action that allows an increase in water pollution is, indeed, a turning back of the clock.

SOME SPENDING CUTS ARE STUPID

Cutting back on the federal government's unnecessary intrusions into our everyday lives was one of the chief campaign promises of candidate Ronald Reagan when he sought the presidency in 1980.

So far, he has been trying mightily to succeed in this area of endeavor.

Hardly a week goes by that we do not get word of some sector in which an attempt is being made to trim the government's role.

That's because much of the government's work is sheer bureaucracy—full of sound and fury and signifying nothing, as Shakespeare so eloquently put it.

The key to success, though, is for the administration to keep in mind that its goal is to cut back only on "unnecessary" intrusions.

There are a good many functions of the government that are vital to the health and well-being of our citizens because they involve the sort of things that people simply cannot do for themselves.

Individuals, for example, cannot protect their environment without the government's assistance.

Yet it was reported this week that the administration is taking a new look at the Clean Water Act, with results that could prove disastrous to residents of this area.

The administration is encouraging cities to scale back on their sewage treatment facilities. This would increase the flow of organic pollutants into rivers and coastal waters.

The government expects up to 800 applications to allow discharge of incompletely treated sewage.

If the requests are granted, it is estimated that municipalities would save between \$4 billion and \$10 billion in construction and operating costs of sewage treatment plants.

Would you care to put a price tag on Lake Erie?

Would you like to sit on the edge of a dead lake, with fish floating belly up and the stench rolling in like the fog, and con-

sole yourself with the thought that, oh well, some cities saved a lot on money on their sewage plants?

There seems to be some difference of opinion, though, over what effect the proposal would have.

Environmental Protection Agency officials admitted the change would increase the flow of organic pollutants into the nation's waters, but said the agency would not permit enough additional pollution to endanger fish habitats or recreational use of the waterways.

Robert G. Hampston, an assistant director of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, said, "We will maintain water quality. We're essentially saying it will not affect water standards."

But Richard Newman, regional water engineer with the same department, warned that marine life and recreational use of the region's waters could be hurt if cities are allowed to cancel plans to build secondary sewage treatment facilities.

Cuyahoga County Sanitary Engineer John J. Garner is even more alarmed. He says that if the removal rate of biological material is allowed to go down to 25 percent, "there will be significant deterioration of our rivers and lake. Some of it will occur immediately." He's talking about Lake Erie.

There are better ways for our government to save money than by turning our rivers and lakes into open sewers.

This is one example of government economy that is ill-advised and stupid.●

CONCERN ABOUT H.R. 6046

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern over H.R. 6046, the Extradition Act of 1982.

I understand the need to revamp our current extradition laws, which have not been revised since 1882, and to bring them in line with the evolving tenets of international law. In doing so, however, we must take precautions to protect those values upon which this Nation was founded—the respect for individual liberty, especially the right to political dissent.

This bill does not provide adequate protection for these rights. Under its provisions, an individual—even an American citizen—could be held without bail on the mere allegation by a foreign government that an extraditable crime had been committed. This would provide foreign governments with powers that our Constitution and laws have explicitly prohibited to our own authorities. The bill would also greatly narrow the definition of the political defense exemption, which now protects political dissidents from extradition proceedings. Moreover, the bill contains insufficient safeguards to insure that a request for extradition is not a veiled attempt to persecute political opposition, and lacks provisions to insure that due process will be guaranteed for the accused.

Democracy and the right to political dissent are uncommon entities in the modern world. If this bill is passed unamended, we in Congress will strike a blow against these all too fragile principles. While international cooperation is necessary to combat terrorism, we must take steps to insure that our own laws do not become an arm of foreign governments engaged in terrible repression of their own peoples.

The Extradition Act is significant not only as an expression of our own Nation's commitment to human rights and individual liberties; it is a matter of life and death to many courageous people who have spoken against tyranny in their own land and sought refuge in this country. It deserves the most careful consideration. I hope this bill will not be scheduled for floor consideration in the next week. If it is, I intend to participate in the debate and will urge others to speak out in support of amendments to protect civil liberties.●

EXHIBITIONS OF AMERICAN ARTISTS

HON. HAROLD WASHINGTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the paintings and graphics of Dr. Margaret Burroughs, a long-time friend and resident of the First Congressional District in Chicago, Ill., will be jointly exhibited in Washington, D.C., with sculptures of the late Marion M. Perkins.

Patrons and scholars of the visual arts will be treated to a highly significant and historical event from September through November 1982 when the talents of Dr. Burroughs and Mr. Perkins will be displayed at the Evans-Tibbs Collection of American Art. The Evans-Tibbs Collection, located at 1910 Vermont Avenue NW., is a non-profit organization formed to preserve and exhibit works of art by and bibliographic material on American artists of known African ancestry. Named for Mrs. Tibbs, an internationally acclaimed lyric soprano known professionally as Madam Evanti, the collection undertakes the presentation of artistic exhibits of historical significance in its galleries for the benefit of the public.

Dr. Burroughs was cited in a White House ceremony honoring Afro-American artists by former President Carter for her achievements in the arts. Gifted with a wide range of artistic talents, she has established herself in the Chicago community not only as a fine artist, but also as a leader in the effort to educate and develop young artists. These efforts and her interests in African-American history and cul-

ture led to her to becoming a founding member of the South Side Community Art Center, originator of the Lake Meadows outdoor art fair, and one of the founders and presently director of the DuSable Museum of African American History.

Mr. Perkins chose to work with stone to create his works. As one of the leaders of the social realist movement in Chicago, Perkins' work communicates this realism within a didactic artistic milieu. His work has been exhibited worldwide and is included in the collections of Chicago's DuSable Museum, the Embassy of Ghana, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the South Side Community Art Center in Chicago—to name a few. In the 1950's, Perkins was awarded several purchase prizes from the famous Chicago Art Institute.

This retrospective exhibition which will highlight the contributions of these two great American artists to 20th century American art, is significant and deserving of national recognition. It is through the brilliant statements in the works of Burroughs and Perkins that significant artistic movements materialized to further develop an American school of expression known as social realism. And, it is through their works and those of other artists, that the American esthetic is preserved.●

RCRA REAUTHORIZATION

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the burning, for energy recovery, of hazardous wastes in boilers and cement kilns without the application of any RCRA requirements is a serious environmental problem that may grow larger in the future. EPA now exempts burning hazardous wastes for the "primary purpose of energy recovery." EPA has never defined what that test is, or how such a test would be applied. Unregulated burning will become even more economically attractive as EPA's regulatory program becomes more effective in closing down illegal practices and in restricting land disposal of hazardous wastes. This burning loophole must be closed now.

The seriousness of this problem has been underscored by a recent report, "Impact of Burning of Hazardous Wastes in Boilers," prepared by Fred G. Hart Associates, Inc., for SCA Chemical Services.

Citing EPA studies, the Hart report shows that one half of all the hazardous waste generated annually in this country is burned as fuel in boilers. That is 20 million metric tons a year exempt from environmental control.

Boilers can destroy as much as 99.99 percent of the hazardous waste feed if they are large, well-maintained, and carefully operated. This is the same standard required by EPA of existing and new hazardous waste incinerators.

But lower destruction efficiencies—from 97 percent to 99.9 percent—are more likely to be found in actual field operations, with some boilers as low as 95 percent. A boiler with a 97 percent destruction efficiency will emit 300 times more pollutants than a permitted incinerator. This means that 1.2 million tons of pollutants may be put into the environment because the boilers cannot meet the same destruction and removal standard as an incinerator. The Hart study estimates that 147 million more people, or 68 percent of the population, may be exposed nationally to pollutants from burning hazardous wastes in boilers with an expected destruction efficiency of 97 percent, rather than 99.99 percent.

This loophole will be eliminated by section 6 of the RCRA reauthorization bill, H.R. 6307. It will require EPA to develop regulations applicable to all facilities that burn hazardous wastes as a fuel. While flexibility is needed, it is clear from this bill that the present regulatory loophole for boilers and cement kilns burning hazardous wastes will not be tolerated. This is not to say that all facilities burning hazardous wastes must be subject to all the requirements applicable to an incinerator, although the incinerator regulations should be the starting-off point.

The Hart report identifies three factors that must be considered in developing a regulatory program for the incineration of [hazardous] waste in boilers:

The design of the boiler—its size and type;
The operating characteristics of the boiler in terms of residence time, temperature, turbulence, and other operating conditions;
The waste to be burned.

The national boiler regulatory program recommended in the Hart report would "differentiate between different types and sizes of boilers and different hazardous wastes to determine whether, and under what conditions, hazardous wastes could be burned."

Until the full regulatory program recommended by the Hart report and required by section 6 of H.R. 6307 is established, EPA should promptly implement an interim regulatory program for manifesting, monitoring, waste analysis, reporting, and record-keeping. This also is a recommendation of the Hart report, which is entirely consistent with the committee's report on H.R. 6307:

The Committee believes that the Standards (under 3004(e)) should include the requirements listed in subsection (a) of Section 3004 as appropriate. EPA may make different standards effective at different times. For example, manifesting and record-keeping may be immediately required, while

other substantive standards may be imposed at a later time within the two year deadline.

H.R. 6307 also requires EPA to regulate persons who blend and sell hazardous wastes as a fuel, in addition to regulating the owners and operators of facilities burning the hazardous wastes. Blended fuels will have to be accompanied by a warning label. Customers would otherwise have no way to know that they are being sold adulterated fuel oil. These provisions applicable to fuel blenders will close this additional regulatory gap, as well as provide consumers with protection against the unscrupulous marketing of blended fuel to unknowing purchasers. The magnitude of this problem is evident from a recent survey by the State of Michigan that estimated that close to 1 billion gallons of blended fuel may be marketed annually in Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, section 6 of H.R. 6307 closes one of the last major loopholes in Congress program to regulate hazardous wastes. Approval of the RCRA Reauthorization Act should be a clear signal that there is a bright economic future for those companies like SCA that are committed to providing environmentally sound hazardous waste treatment services. Profitability and environmental controls are, in fact, mutually reinforcing. The demand for high technology hazardous waste treatment services will continue and grow, because the Congress will not tolerate midnight dumping, indiscriminate land disposal, or unregulated burning of hazardous wastes.●

THE CHERISH PROGRAM

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Second Annual Cherish Picnic, which is being held in Merced, Calif., on Wednesday, September 29. The Cherish program is a project of the Merced County Community Action Agency and is a model for other senior citizens programs throughout the State and Nation.

The Cherish project has provided nutritional, health, recreational, and information services at seven locations throughout Merced County and has been able to do so with the support and cooperation of the communities of Merced County.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend those who have contributed their time and efforts to make the quality of life better for the senior citizens of Merced County and to recognize the outstanding support which the community has given to the Cherish project.●

A SALUTE TO ELDER BURTON D. CLEMONS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with the members of the Tower of Prayer Church of God in Christ and countless other persons in northeastern Ohio in saluting Elder Burton D. Clemons' 25th year in the ministry. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Elder Clemons, is the pastor of this well-known and highly regarded church in Akron, Ohio. On Saturday, September 18, 1982, the church membership will host a testimonial dinner in Akron in honor of his tireless work in the church and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of few other persons who have been such a pillar of strength and shining star in the community as Elder Clemons. Through his successful business endeavors and the religious inspiration he has shared with his church members and the community, Elder Clemons has made an indelible mark on the fiber of that community and the souls and hearts of many people.

Because of his numerous achievements within the church and the community, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to capsize the life of Elder Clemons for my colleagues.

Elder Burton Delano Clemons came to Ohio and the city of Cleveland in 1946. He attended and graduated from the Cleveland public schools in 1950. He later received a bachelor of arts degree in marketing psychology from my alma mater, the Cleveland State University. Currently, he is a senior candidate for a masters degree in pastoral counseling and psychology at the Ashland Theological Seminary.

Mr. Speaker, Elder Clemons and his lovely wife, Gene, have seven children, one of which, Lori, served a few years ago as my congressional page. All of his children have excelled educationally and have become productive contributors in their respective communities.

Mr. Speaker, the excellence of his children and their instinctive determination to succeed mirrors Elder Clemons' drive for success. He has reached heights of achievement that few men even dare to dream of.

Elder Clemons was involved in several businesses over a period of 28 years. He owned and operated two successful service stations. The last one was one of the highest volumed Shell stations in Ohio. He was awarded a franchised auto dealership by the Chrysler Motor Corp. and became the first black to be so designated in the State of Ohio. During 1977, Elder Clemons was saluted by Black Enterprise magazine as

the youngest member of the top 100 black businesses in America. He remained a member of this exclusive group of black entrepreneurs as long as he was in business. Mr. Speaker, in 1977, during the Holy Convocation in Memphis, Tenn., the Church of God in Christ honored him as the Pentecostal businessman of the year.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps more than any other achievement, Elder Clemons is respected for and would point to his work in the church as his primary reason for existence. He accepted his call into the ministry in 1957. He was licensed in 1958 and ordained in 1965.

During that time, he worked with the Williams Temple Church of God in Christ in a host of positions including the trustee board, youth Sunday school superintendent, Boy Scout institutional representative, associate minister and district Y.P.W.W. president.

In March 1968, Elder Clemons was appointed pastor of the Prayer Tower Church of God in Christ in Akron, Ohio. Even though the spirits of the church members were low when elder Clemons came, effectively combining his spirit and positive determination to uplift the work of the Lord, Elder Clemons became a positive catalyst for the church and the surrounding community. Under his leadership, the church has acquired and paid for property valued at over \$100,000. Elder Clemons was given a vision by the Lord and decided to change the name of the church to the Tower of Prayer. This name change was to appropriately reflect the new mission of the church which he believes will become the center of prayer for Akron and northeastern Ohio.

Together with his wife and the support of the members of the Tower of Prayer Church of God in Christ in Akron, Elder Clemons is bringing a new meaning to the word "church". The church services and ministries are extended far beyond the church building in an attempt to wrestle with the problems of the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that Elder Burton Delano Clemons is a rare and dynamic human being and servant of God. During his 25 years in the ministry and 28 years in the business world, he has done more than the average human being could ever hope to achieve in a lifetime. He has truly been a blessing to all of those who have come to know and love him. On behalf of the residents of the 21st Congressional District of Ohio, I take this opportunity to salute Elder Clemons on the occasion of the testimonial dinner in his honor on Saturday, September 18, 1982. ●

REFORM OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Task Force on the Budget of the Rules Committee. The relationship of the Federal budget to the social and economic needs of the Nation is a paramount issue. The task force has the responsibility to consider changes in the budget process that will make it more responsive to what is happening in the Nation.

I want to share with my colleagues a few of the points I made and recommendations that I offered. A summary follows:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Task Force. What is it we are budgeting for, when we consider budget resolutions? Where do we want to go in the nation, and do the budgets we write enable us to get there?

As it now stands, the budget process is, at best, counterproductive to the necessary task of debating, determining, setting and implementing national social and economic goals. As long as budgets are written, as they are now, without a conception of the goals we ought to pursue and the policies and programs we ought to create, we then are simply budgeting in a vacuum.

I suggest that my colleagues review, if they have not already, an article that appeared in the Washington Post on September 5, 1982, entitled "Summer of '82: A Journal of Distress: Across the Land, Recession Takes Toll." The article describes the following reality: mainstreets of small towns across the country in which most of the shops are boarded up . . . families, roaming nomadically from town to town, camping out on riverbeds or in public parks, unable to find work . . . individuals who scavenge for food or things of value . . . children separated from their fathers so that they can obtain meager public assistance . . . disillusion and despair in many places, in the sunbelt as well as the frostbelt.

These Americans described in the article are simply unable to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, which happens to be the official social theory in Washington today. Nor can the corporations, or State and local governments, or voluntary organizations do for them what they need to have done. They need jobs, adequate income, security. They need to see the factories of America at full production. This will not happen in any decent interval of time without a national, federal effort and a national, federal plan of action.

What do the budgets we write have to do with this reality? I am afraid, very little. In our budget process, we basically set aside consideration of national social and economic needs. Because our budgets do not relate to national goals—a number of which like full employment are statutory goals, in the law—our nation's needs go unaddressed in any rational, systematic way, and whatever our goals happen to be, they are simply unimplementable and unenforceable.

The Council of State Planning Agencies a year ago published a report entitled, "America in Ruins: Beyond the Public Works Pork

Barrel." The study depicts a national public infrastructure of roads, bridges, dams, water and sewage systems, and public buildings that is in a state of acute decay. The study estimates that it will cost upwards of \$3 trillion to repair and rebuild the nation's infrastructure. Do our budget resolutions address this reality? Unfortunately, no.

I am proposing that the budget process be directly linked, and become a part of, a framework for national and local economic planning. Budgeting has to be linked to planning. There is no other way for Congress to deal with the economic crisis in the nation today other than to inventory and assess the needs of citizens and communities in a comprehensive way, formulate alternative national plans for dealing with them, and set a series of economic and social goals, as well as fiscal ones, through the budget process, that would become the instrument for implementing these goals and plans.

A proposal similar to this was advanced in 1975 by Chairman Bolling, which he called a "Balanced Economic Growth Plan." A proposal for planning and budgeting that I happen to think is very sound was advanced several years ago by Mr. Nat Weinberg, chief economist of the U.A.W. for 28 years, and a member of the National Commission on Supplies and Shortages, to whom he presented his plan. That proposal was subsequently printed by G.P.O. under the title, "Additional Views of Commissioner Weinberg on Indicative Planning."

Mr. Weinberg envisages that alternative national plans would be proposed by an independent, federal planning commission. The President and Congress would consider the plans or propose entirely new ones. These plans would be debated before the American people. Congress would approve a plan, and the budget resolutions would be required to be consistent with the objectives of the plan.

Under this framework of planning an budgeting, budget resolutions would stipulate goals for employment, production, investment, etc., as well as the current revenue and spending goals.

In 1945, Congress and the President were concerned about the 11 million fighting men and women, and the 12 million other citizens engaged in wartime production, who would have to find jobs in a post-war civilian economy. In response to President Roosevelt's call for a right to a job for every American, a group of Senators led by James Murray of Montana introduced the first full Employment bill. A centerpiece of that legislation was the "National Production and Employment Budget," a form of budgeting that is very close to what I have been talking about today.

Today we are discussing budget reform in the context of a deepening and spreading economic crisis. It has been festering for years. The crisis is not just a matter of cyclical ups and downs, but of long-term industrial and economic decline. The economy may perk up now and then, and yet it is likely to remain chronically stagnant. The cumulative impact of this long-stand decline and distress is staggering. The Task Force, in recommending changes in the budget process, has an opportunity to transform the budget process into an instrument for achieving the goals that all of us want to see achieved. ●

**"CHINA CARD" IS RUSSIAN
ROULETTE**

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan, in his historic address to Parliament in London, called for all freedom-loving peoples to relegate communism to its rightful place on the ash heap of history.

We in the United States can best respond to that call by consistently opposing communism in whatever form, be it Soviet-style, Chinese-style or Eurocommunism.

Much has been made of the differences between the Marxism of Mao and his successors in Red China and the Marxism of Lenin and his legacy in the Soviet Union.

Some even suggest that U.S. policy should exploit these differences. In our relations with the Soviets, it is called playing the China card.

Mr. Speaker, foreign policy is not a game. Playing the China card is closer to Russian roulette than diplomacy. It does not comfort me that the Soviets and Red Chinese disagree over how to bury us.

In fact, the stronger the Chinese Communists become, the more likely it is they will find accommodation with the Soviets. The game of playing the China card can only end in one of two ways: War with the Soviet Union or Chinese-Soviet reconciliation.

Dr. Ku Cheng-kang examined this subject in depth in an address before the Captive Nations Week meeting of the Republic of China in Taipei. I hope my colleagues will study his remarks of July 23, 1982, carefully.

**GLOBAL CAMPAIGN FOR DEMOCRACY TO DEFEAT
MARXISM-LENINISM**

(By Dr. Ku Cheng-Kang)

Premier Sun, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, A sacred task of all men is to protect and promote freedom. A fundamental requirement of the task is salvation of captive peoples. More than 1 billion people of the world are in chains under Communist tyranny, and the freedom of the free world is seriously threatened by expansionist Communists. This Captive Nations Week Meeting today is to make freedom-loving people the world over bring forth their strength for freedom against Communism so as to enhance the freedom of the free and wipe slavery off the other half of the world.

**I. ULTIMATE VICTORY OF FREEDOM AND
DEMOCRACY**

All indications are that the present dark period of man's history is about to be over. Forces of freedom and democracy are rising vigorously as the main stream of the age.

Communist rule is suffering insuperable crises, as testified by the heroic Polish struggle and by the Chinese mainland situation that has forced the Peiping regime to call for learning from Taiwan. The Afghans and Salvadoreans are bravely hitting back at the Communists.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The march of the Chinese in the name of the Three Principles of the People against Peiping's Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist-Maoism is the most forceful proof that those who stand for freedom and democracy will ultimately triumph over all Communists.

II. RED UNITED FRONT SCHEMES

The Communists are bent on world communization and human enslavement. There is no possibility whatsoever of their peaceful coexistence with freedom and democracy. We must not entertain the wishful hope that we may through negotiation maintain the balance needed for coexistence with Communists.

Nevertheless, the Communists have kept launching peace offensives, proffering baits of peace possibilities. Such united front moves are to spiritually disarm free democratic forces, weaken the free world defense, and create conditions for armed aggression.

The Soviets have since World War II used negotiations as covers for their positive development of nuclear weapons and missiles, and of naval and air strength.

The Chinese Communists are pushing their peace talk united front schemes. Their attempt is to hoodwink international circles, deceive and force the United States into stopping arms sales to the Republic of China, weaken and isolate the ROC, then use force for their venture across the Taiwan Straits.

Free nations must know well that this is not the first time the Chinese Communists are pushing peace talk united front designs. They had on three occasions in the past half century relied on such offensives for expansion. They repeatedly said that Communism did not suit the Chinese environments, that the Three Principles of the People should be implemented, and that they would not resort to rioting and other tactics of communization. Away from the conference table, however, they augmented their strength through treacherous means and rose to usurp the Chinese mainland power. These bitter lessons must be remembered by all, not just by the Chinese but by all the free people of the world. We must blast all such Communist united front schemes. We should never allow the Communists to wreck the morale and unity of the free democratic camp.

III. IDEALS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Observance of the Captive Nations Week is to promote assistance to the struggle for freedom, democracy, and human rights waged by those held captive behind the Iron Curtain. Communist tyranny over them should never be regarded as an unchangeable fact.

Truly praise-worthy are President Reagan's Captive Nations Week Proclamation of July 16 and the speech he made, in a tone fully reflecting his righteous spirit and moral courage, at that first public signing of the annual proclamation. We strongly support Mr. Reagan's call for the renewal of "our sacred resolve that someday all the people of the earth will enjoy the God-given rights of free men and women," and for the reaffirmation of "our faith over the rule of force and coercion which denies human rights to many other parts of the world today." The President also said: "We renew especially our hope that those countries of Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America now under Communist domination will someday regain their national sovereignty and, again, enjoy the dignity of their own national tradition." This should be taken earnestly by all as the sacred goal of

September 16, 1982

the "Captive Nations Week" campaign today.

The lofty ideals of Captive Nations Week observance must be held high. If free nations were to reconcile with the Communists and let them continue human enslavement, masses of people behind the Iron Curtain of the East and the West would be grievously disappointed in the free democratic forces outside.

The lofty ideals of Captive Nations Week observance must be fully attained. All the people of the free world must rise and squarely face the crises provoked by the expansionist Red slavemasters. Unity and action must be enhanced against them. Efforts must continue for the return of freedom and independence to captive peoples and nations.

IV. RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT REAGAN'S CALL

When addressing Members of Parliament in London on June 8, President Reagan called for a global march of democracy to leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history.

As we respond to that call, we must emphasize that a global campaign for democracy requires first of all a clear demarcation between friend and foe, and that all the Marxist-Leninist regimes should be dealt with. We must stand against Soviet Russia, against the Chinese Communists, and against all other Red regimes. As a tyrannical regime with persistence in Marxism-Leninism written into its constitution, Peiping should be a primary target of the campaign. The Marxist-Leninist regimes of Peiping and Moscow must both be left on the ash heap of history. Fundamentally, anti-Marxism-Leninism does not allow any double standard permitting cooperation with the Chinese Communists for opposition to the Russians.

A strong stand against Marxism-Leninism on the Chinese mainland is the effective first step against Marxism-Leninism in the Soviet Union. Once the 1 billion Chinese are freed from the Marxist-Leninist yoke, peace and security can be assured in the entire Asian-Pacific region. Once the 1 billion people are added to the free democratic camp, the Marxist-Leninist Russian expansionists certainly will be checked.

A global campaign for democracy requires full implementation of President Reagan's stand for peace through strength. In other words, all the free democratic nations must first be able to effectively defend their freedom and security. A global campaign for democracy must start with the U.S. extending assistance to those free democratic nations requiring help against Red aggression.

V. REQUIRED ANTI-COMMUNIST STEPS TODAY

We fully concur in President Reagan's outstanding view that the nature of the struggle between freedom and slavery "is ultimately one that will be decided, not by military might, but by spiritual resolve and confidence in the future of freedom, especially in the face of the decaying and crumbling dreams of Marxism-Leninism."

A prerequisite of anti-Communism is that the free world should not be so eager about peace through power balance as to sacrifice captive peoples or damage the rights and interests of any free democratic nation.

The focus of the "Captive Nations Week" campaign in the present stage should be fully in line with the calls President Reagan issued in his latest historic speech. The weapon in our hand that is much stronger than conquest, deception, and sabotage is the strength of truth. We must fully inject

this strength into Iron Curtain campaigns for freedom and into a global alliance for peace.

The U.S. Government must immediately translate into action the clear-cut, forceful calls of President Reagan. The first step should be rejection of the contradictory tactics of cooperation with the Chinese Marxist-Leninists for opposition to the Marxist-Leninist Russians.

As proven by facts, rapport with the Marxist-Leninist Chinese can only spur the expansionist moves of Marxist-Leninist Russians into the Western Pacific, South Asia, Latin America, and Africa. The United States must refrain from creating another strong Marxist-Leninist force by helping the presently confused and backward Chinese Communists.

What if the Chinese Communists really grow? The better they become able to confront Moscow, the greater the possibility will be of reconciliation between the two Marxist-Leninist regimes. The danger of American association with Peiping is either walking into the regime's trap where the U.S. will find itself at war with the Soviets, or prompting Moscow and Peiping to rejoin hands for a joint world communization drive.

To avert such dangers, the United States must stop befriending the Marxist-Leninist Chinese, sternly reject their interference, faithfully implement the Taiwan Relations Act, and help the Republic of China enhance its military strength for the defense of freedom and democracy. Support to the ROC is also to facilitate China's free democratic unification. That is the only way to end Marxism-Leninism in China. That also is the only effective way to blot Marxism-Leninism out of Russia.

Ladies and gentlemen: Communist challenges to man's freedom are unprecedented. Now is the time for all the free democratic forces to unite strongly and deal blows at Marxist-Leninist forces of enslavement. We should urge all the free democratic nations to respond to President Reagan's call for a global campaign for democracy. We should see to it that free nations convene a conference on anti-Marxism-Leninism. All those who stand for democracy, irrespective of race, nationality, political background, diplomatic connection, and religious belief, should forge a strong unity and carry out these three major tasks:

First, development of the "Captive Nations Week" Movement into a global campaign for the elimination of Marxism-Leninism and enslavement, and for the establishment of a great alliance for freedom, democracy, and peace.

Second, establishment of a global anti-Communist strategy that joins the regional defense organizations and expand them into a global common security system for freedom and democracy.

Third, positive support to the anti-tyranny struggle everywhere behind the Iron Curtain and to the struggle of threatened nations to safeguard their freedom. Spiritual resolve and strength of truth must be fully brought forth for a thorough destruction of the Marxist-Leninist stronghold.

Ladies and gentlemen: At this turning point of history, all the Chinese should, together with all other freedom-loving people of the world, enhance unity and redouble efforts for a thorough defeat of Marxism-Leninism, and for a decisive victory of freedom and democracy.●

THE EXTRADITION ACT OF 1982—FULL DEBATE IS NEEDED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that what happened in the Senate in mid-August not be repeated in the House—that the proposed Extradition Act of 1982, H.R. 6046, not be rammed through this legislative body without due consideration, debate and amendment. If this bill is brought to the floor at all, it should be with an open rule allowing full and complete consideration.

While our extradition procedures do need to be modernized, this must not be done at the expense of weakening civil liberties and the United States reputation as a refuge for those who are victims of authoritarian regimes.

There are a number of specific provisions in the bill which bear further debate and modification. First, the proposed act would remove the authority of the courts to decide whether the alleged criminal is protected by the political nature of his crime and would instead give sole discretion to the Secretary of State. Not only would this pose a threat to our constitutional system of checks and balances, but it would make these decisions subject to political pressure from countries with whom we have extradition treaties—El Salvador, for example.

Second, the accused, even if he is an American citizen, could be arrested without any proof that he is guilty of a crime. As the ACLU, which joins many other civil liberty and human rights groups in opposing this bill, states.

A foreign government's mere, unsubstantiated allegation that an American citizen had, on a visit to the country, conspired to commit a violent act, coupled with a promise to produce evidence at a later date, would compel that the person be held without bail for at least 10 and perhaps for more than 60 days.

Finally, the bill would restrict the definition of political offense to exclude ameliorating circumstances such as when a person uses violence to escape from a foreign prison where he is being tortured. Under the present language there would be no political exception defense to extradition in this, or similarly justifiable circumstances.

This bill is in opposition to everything we hold sacred in the American system of justice. It presumes guilt, puts the burden of proof on the accused and subordinates the U.S. judiciary to foreign regimes who would deal in torture and repression.

I feel certain that when my colleagues take a good look at the provisions of this bill, they will have a good

deal more to say about it—and against it.●

H.R. 6113—OCEAN DUMPING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1982

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 20, 1982, the House will consider under suspension of the rules H.R. 6113, the Ocean Dumping Amendments Act of 1982. H.R. 6113 was ordered reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on May 5, 1982, and was referred sequentially to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation which reported the bill with amendments on July 29, 1982. Subsequently, both committees have reached an agreement on amendments to H.R. 6113 that would reconcile the differences in the bill as reported by each committee. An amendment in the nature of a substitute will be offered in the motion to suspend the rules. The following is the substitute that will be offered:

That this Act may be cited as the "Ocean Dumping Amendments Act of 1982".

SEC. 2. DUMPING PERMIT PROGRAM.

(a) Section 102 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1412) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a)(C) by striking out "and beaches." and inserting in lieu thereof ", beaches, and wetlands."; and

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The Administrator shall designate sites at which materials may be dumped pursuant to this section and, after consultation with the Secretary, at which materials may be dumped pursuant to section 103; except that no site may be designated by the Administrator under this subsection until the Administrator undertakes and completes an analysis of the characteristics of the site and its suitability for dumping and of the environmental effects which will likely result from dumping. In undertaking such an analysis of each site, the Administrator shall take into consideration the criteria set forth in subsection (a) and shall specifically take into account the following factors:

"(A) The types and quantities of wastes and pollutants projected to be deposited in, and adjacent to, the site from dumping and other sources.

"(B) The ability of the waters at the site to disperse, detoxify, or neutralize the materials.

"(C) The importance of the site to the surrounding biological community, including the presence of breeding, spawning, nursery or foraging areas, migratory pathways, or areas necessary for other functions or critical stages in the life cycle of marine organisms.

"(D) The immediate and cumulative effects on human health and on the ecosystem adjacent to the site and the persistent effects on the ecosystem within the site.

Nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary under section 103.

"(2) The Administrator shall—

"(A) periodically monitor, or cause to be monitored, the effects of the dumping of materials at or adjacent to each site for which the Administrator determines, on the basis of the characteristics of the site and the materials to be dumped, that such monitoring is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title; and

"(B) at the close of the third year after the site designation and at every three-year interval thereafter until such time as the designation is terminated, estimate the extent of the dumping and other waste inputs that will occur in and adjacent to each site during the next three-year period.

"(3) If at any time the Administrator, on the basis of the factors taken into account under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (1), or on the basis of the monitoring or estimates, or both, required under paragraph (2), determines that the site is no longer suitable for such dumping, the Administrator shall—

"(A) limit dumping at the site to certain materials or at certain times or both; or

"(B) suspend or terminate the designation of the site under paragraph (1).

In making a determination under the preceding sentence that a site is no longer suitable for dumping pursuant to section 103, the Administrator shall consult the Secretary."

(b) Section 103(b) of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1413(b)) is amended by striking "recommended" in the last sentence.

SEC. 3. PERMIT CONDITIONS.

Section 104 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1414) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Permits issued under this title shall designate and include—

"(1) the type of material authorized to be transported for dumping or to be dumped;

"(2) the amount of material authorized to be transported for dumping or to be dumped;

"(3) the location where such transport for dumping will be terminated or where such dumping will occur;

"(4) the length of time for which the permits are valid and their expiration date;

"(5) any special provisions deemed necessary by the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, to minimize the harm from dumping, which may include measures that the permittee must take to plan, develop, acquire, or implement, as appropriate—

"(A) alternatives for the disposal of the material,

"(B) processes for reducing or eliminating any contaminants in the material, or

"(C) processes for recycling the material;

"(6) after consultation with the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, any special provisions deemed necessary by the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, for the monitoring and surveillance of the transportation or dumping; and

"(7) such other matters as the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, deems appropriate."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, shall prescribe and collect from the applicant, unless the applicant

is a Federal agency, an application fee in an amount commensurate with the reasonable administrative costs incurred or expected to be incurred by the Administrator or Secretary in processing the permit. The application fee shall be deposited to the principal appropriation account or accounts used to carry out the processing of permits under this title."

(3) The following new subsections are added at the end thereof:

"(h) The Administrator or Secretary, as the case may be, may prescribe such reporting requirements as he or she deems appropriate with regard to actions taken by permittees pursuant to permits issued under this title.

"(i)(1) Two years after the date of the enactment of the Ocean Dumping Amendments Act of 1982, the Administrator may not issue a permit under this title for the disposal of radioactive waste material until the applicant, in addition to complying with all other requirements under this title, prepares, with respect to the site at which the disposal is proposed, a Radioactive Material Disposal Impact Assessment which shall include—

"(A) a listing of all radioactive materials in each container to be disposed, the number of containers to be dumped, the structural diagrams of each container, the number of curies of each material in each container, and exposure levels in rems at the inside and outside of each container;

"(B) an analysis of the environmental impact of the proposed action, at the site at which the applicant desires to dispose of the material, upon human health and welfare and marine life;

"(C) any adverse environmental effects at the site which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

"(D) an analysis of the resulting environmental and economic conditions if the containers fail to contain the radioactive waste material when initially deposited at the specific site;

"(E) a plan for the removal or containment of the disposed nuclear material if the container leaks or decomposes;

"(F) a determination by each affected State whether the proposed action is consistent with its approved Coastal Zone Management Program;

"(G) an analysis of the economic impact upon other users of marine resources;

"(H) alternatives to the proposed action;

"(I) comments and results of consultation with States officials and public hearings held in the coastal states that are nearest to the affected areas;

"(J) a comprehensive monitoring plan to be carried out by the applicant to determine the full effect of the disposal on the marine environment, living resources, or human health, which plan shall include, but not be limited to, the monitoring of exterior container radiation samples, the taking of water and sediment samples, and fish and benthic animal samples, adjacent to the containers, and the acquisition of such other information as the Administrator may require; and

"(K) such other information which the Administrator may require in order to determine the full effects of such disposal.

"(2) The Administrator shall include, in any permit to which paragraph (1) applies, such terms and conditions as may be necessary to ensure that the monitoring plan required under paragraph (1)(J) is fully implemented, including the analysis by the Administrator of the samples required to be taken under the plan.

"(3) The Administrator shall submit a copy of the assessment prepared under paragraph (1) with respect to any permit to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

"(4)(A) No permit to which this subsection applies shall take effect before the 45th calendar day of continuous session of the Congress after the day on which the permit was issued, and shall be terminated by the Administrator if before the close of such 45th day either House of Congress by resolution disapproves its taking effect.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the continuity of a session of the Congress shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the 45-day period. If a permit subject to this subsection is issued during any Congress and the last session of such Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the 45 calendar days of continuous session (or a permit is granted after the last session of the Congress adjourns sine die), the permit shall be deemed to have been reissued on the first day of the succeeding Congress and the 45-day period referred to in subparagraph (A) shall commence on the day after such first day."

SEC. 4. CONVENTION ADHERENCE.

Section 106 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1416) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) To the extent that they may do so without relaxing the requirements of this title, the Administrator and the Secretary shall adhere to and apply the requirements of the Convention, including its annexes, that are binding upon the United States."

SEC. 5. TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.

(a) Until completion of the site designation or denial of site designation by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to any areas of ocean waters approved for dumping on an interim basis before July 1, 1982, and any areas of ocean waters used for dumping pursuant to a court order, the amendments made by this act to the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (other than subsection (c) (2) and (3) of section 102 thereof as added by section 2(a)(2) of this Act and other than those made by sections 3, 5(b), 8, 9, and 10 of this Act) shall not be applicable to those areas of ocean water.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to the contrary, during the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, no permit may be issued under such title I that authorizes the dumping of any low-level radioactive waste unless the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency determines—

(1) that the proposed dumping is necessary to conduct research—

(A) on new technology related to ocean dumping, or

(B) to determine the degree to which the dumping of such substance will degrade the marine environment;

(2) that the scale of the proposed dumping is limited to the smallest amount of such material and the shortest duration of time that is necessary to fulfill the purposes

of the research, such that the dumping will have minimal adverse impact upon human health, welfare, and amenities, and the marine environment, ecological systems, economic potentialities, and other legitimate uses;

(3) after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, that the potential benefits of such research will outweigh any such adverse impact; and

(4) that the proposed dumping will be preceded by appropriate baseline monitoring studies of the proposed dump site and its surrounding environment.

Each permit issued pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to such conditions and restrictions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to minimize possible adverse impacts of such dumping.

SEC. 6. DEFINITION OF "MONITORING".

Section 3 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1402) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) 'Monitoring' means the systematic, time-series observation of materials, contaminants, or pertinent components of the marine ecosystem over a period of time sufficient to determine the existing levels, trends, and natural variations of measured components in the water column, sediments, and biota for the purpose of ensuring that immediate harmful effects of dumping are detected, and cumulative and long-term effects are detected, forecasted, and evaluated. Observations may include, but are not limited to, the following procedures, depending upon the type of waste to be dumped and the characteristics of the site: (1) seasonal sampling and analyses of the infaunal community and sediment for purposes of characterizing structural composition and size distribution; (2) sampling and analyses of sediment and selected organisms to determine levels of hydrocarbon, trace metals, and chemical and pathogenic contaminants identified as constituents of wastes to be dumped; (3) profiling measurements of standard oceanographic parameters including dissolved oxygen, salinity, and water temperature; (4) characterization of large-scale surface topography and megafaunal structure and composition; and (5) sampling and analyses to determine levels of nutrients and organic carbon."

SEC. 7. DEFINITION OF "OCEAN WATERS".

Section 3(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1402(b)) is amended by inserting "and the subjacent areas," immediately after "those waters".

SEC. 8. WRITS OF MANDAMUS.

Section 105(g) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (5) as subparagraph (6) and adding the following:

"(5) Upon application of any person, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus commanding the Administrator to implement in a timely manner the site designation provisions of this title, as applicable either pursuant to court order or upon application for a permit under section 102 or section 103, except that nothing in this paragraph is intended to affect the conduct of any dumping activity under a permit issued under this title pending the completion of site designation proceedings. Paragraph (4) of this subsection shall not apply to any suit brought pursuant to this paragraph."; and

(2) by striking the word "injunctive" in redesignated subparagraph (6).

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 111 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1420) is amended by striking "and" immediately following "fiscal year 1981," and inserting "and not to exceed \$4,213,000 for fiscal year 1983," immediately after "fiscal year 1982,".

SEC. 10. SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish a schedule for expeditiously completing the study and designation or denial of designation of all areas of ocean waters approved before July 1, 1982, for dumping on an interim basis and areas of ocean waters used for dumping pursuant to a court order. The Administrator shall submit this schedule to Congress not later than the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this section.●

LONG-TERM SOLUTION TO UNEMPLOYMENT?

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, our unemployed people today need permanent, productive jobs in the private sector, not temporary, make-work jobs funded by the taxpayers.

Yet that is what they would get if we pass the public works job proposal. If we have learned nothing more in the last 2 years, most Americans have learned that we must not regress to the worn-out, bankrupt public jobs programs of the past.

Federal spending on such short-term, unproductive efforts has been one of the major causes of today's chronic unemployment predicament. We are confusing the cure with the cause of the insidious unemployment illness that plagues the country today.

Indeed this proposed "cure" may well be worse than the disease. While the proposals contained in the urgent supplemental for the Department of Labor for a job creation program may at first appear inviting, they do little, in reality, to solve the plethora of unemployment difficulties facing our Nation in the long run. Unemployment has remained the one area which the economic recovery program has yet failed to conquer and, to aid the American jobless, Congress recently extended the termination deadline for unemployment compensation benefits.

The jobs program contained in House Joint Resolution 562 appropriates a sum equal to 5 percent of the latest estimated level of unemployment compensation benefits, a figure approximating \$1 billion, for the creation of public and community service jobs. It is estimated that this program will provide jobs for 200,000 workers for a period of 6 months.

Although I would rather see these unemployed Americans working than collecting unemployment as they look for a job, this program is simply a short-term, quick-fix answer to a long-term problem. It is unacceptable to promote this temporary program as a solution to employment difficulties facing this Nation. Employing 200,000 of the Nation's 10 million unemployed to perform make-work services for 6 months, only to throw them back into the streets with no new marketable skills or training will not even begin to heal our unemployment wounds.

The return of a healthy labor force will require a drastic reshaping of our work force so that it will keep up with the technological, fast-moving economic world of America's future. Clearly, the retraining of our workers is the primary task necessary to prepare America for its latest industrial revolution and, at the same time, reduce unemployment. In response to this challenge, Congress has already initiated legislation, the Job Training Partnership Act which is presently in conference, to redraw the face of labor.

Examples of the shortage of certain skills are quickly becoming apparent. Machinists are a case in point. The average age of the Nation's machinists is 58 and many are beginning to retire, but only a quarter of those needed to replace them are being trained. It is estimated by the National Tooling and Machining Association that the shortage of machinists will grow to 240,000 by 1985.

In fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that over 1 million skilled jobs went unfilled last year, despite the 10 million Americans who were looking for work. The face of American industry and business is rapidly changing. Labor must be provided the opportunity to change it. Just as American agriculture became mechanized and reduced its work force, American manufacturing and other industries are doing the same. It is therefore urgent that our workers be retrained for the skilled jobs that will be demanded.

Along with this retraining effort, the President's program to reduce interest rates must be continued. These high rates have remained the principal cause of unemployment in such beleaguered industries as housing and construction. The economic recovery program has already yielded a significant reduction in interest rates. These initiatives must not be halted in order that the rates may be further reduced.

This program is further unacceptable because it will add significantly to the Federal deficit. As such, the Martin substitute, drawing its funds from the unused synfuels budget, will not counteract the deficit reductions already accomplished by this Con-

gress. However, neither of these alternatives will achieve a long-term solution to the unemployment problem we currently face. Both, despite their obvious differences, would not offer a permanent cure.

Finally, the American people must not be misled to believe that quick fix programs such as this jobs bill will yield long-term corrective solutions to the deep-seated difficulties of unemployment. This proposal is simply a temporary solution which will not correct the problem, but will delay the constructive application of real solutions. Retraining labor and lowering interest rates are the answer for the long run, while this jobs program will continue the attempt to postpone reality another 6 months.●

CHRIST CHURCH OF SHORT HILLS, N.J.

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of an organization which has played a significant role in the lives of many people of my district. Christ Church of Short Hills, N.J., is celebrating its centennial this year. In the past century, the church has grown from 19 founding members to an active body of over 800 congregants.

Since its first service on October 15, 1882, Christ Church has continued its tradition of involvement with the town of Short Hills, one of the oldest and most beautiful suburban communities in the United States. True to Short Hills' community ideals, Christ Church, as reflected in its motto "Ye are all one in Christ," has been operated as a community church to serve all denominations. Through programs such as Outreach, which donates time and money to worthy projects, the church has developed its long and distinguished history of worship, fellowship, and service.

I am introducing a joint resolution to commemorate the centennial of Christ Church of Short Hills. I ask the Members of the 97th Congress to join me in offering their congratulations in the hope that 100 years from now our successors will be able to offer it bicentennial congratulations.●

A FRENCH PERSPECTIVE ON THE U.S. BREEDER PROGRAM

HON. MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, Dr. George Vendryes, Di-

rector Delegate attached to the Office of the Chairman of France's Atomic Energy Commission, and one of the chief architects of that country's fast breeder reactor development program, visited with me and other Members to discuss the French nuclear power development activities and to give us his view of the role of the U.S. nuclear breeder reactor program from a global perspective. I would like to submit for the RECORD a report of that meeting prepared by the staff of my Energy Research and Production Subcommittee.

REPORT ON MEETING WITH MEMBERS AND DR. G. VENDRYES (CEA) AND MR. BARRE (NUCLEAR ATTACHE)

The morning meeting was attended by the following Members: Mrs. Bouquard, Mr. Brown, Mr. Shamansky, Mr. Bevell, Mr. Morrison.

Dr. Vendryes began with a discussion of the status of the Super Phenix plant at Creys-Malville. Construction is about 75 percent complete. All of the critical parts of the reactor structure are enclosed and under security. Within six months, all nuclear parts will be enclosed. By mid-year of 1983, they will begin sodium tests at uniform temperature as well as check the operation of components under sodium. Power production is expected to begin in mid-1984.

Mr. Bevell asked Dr. Vendryes to express his views regarding the Clinch River project. Accordingly, he reiterated his strong support for this U.S. effort, "The U.S. needs a vigorous breeder program, because the breeder will be needed in the future to solve the world's energy problem." He did not place much credence in the timing arguments used by the project's detractors. In France, the urgency is probably greater than in the U.S. because of their lack of domestic resources such as coal, gas or oil. However, the fact remains, according to Dr. Vendryes, that the breeder will be needed on a global scale. In his view, the U.S. invests more dollars than France in breeder research and technology; but this larger investment is meaningless unless it is focused on producing and operating a powerplant such as CRBR.

The U.S. was definitely the world leader in breeder technology when France decided to develop their own program some 28 years ago. Dr. Vendryes recalled his early visits to the U.S. and his discussions with Walter Zinn of Argonne. These visits and conversations influenced France's decision to start their own fast breeder program. It was clear at that time that (1) sodium technology was well in hand; (2) the U.S. was confident of its ability to produce breeders. As a result the French engineers (Vendryes, et al.) became convinced that they also could master the technology of breeders and operate them safely.

Since that time France has pursued its program without interruption. The effort has had the political and financial support of the political leadership throughout this period of some 27 years, not an insignificant fact when one considers the multiplicity of governments ruling France over this period of time. The French Government did not question priority or budgets as far as France's effort to develop nuclear power in general, and the breeder in particular. He cited the following reasons for this support. First, all French leaders were sure that the breeder will be needed as an important com-

ponent of the global energy supply. Second, over the past 25 years, France was able to develop solid expertise through its national utility system and assembling and training highly qualified technical and engineering support personnel. In his view, continuity of effort in a project of the magnitude of CRBR cannot sustain a five-to-ten-year delay without risking the loss of expertise and competence. People become disenchanted and leave for greener pastures. It took France 20 years to develop the level of professional expertise they have.

Mr. Bevell then asked if Parliament has been supporting their breeder work at 100 percent, or has their been opposition? Dr. Vendryes responded by noting that of the four major political parties in France, and before the present administration was elected to office, the two majority parties strongly supported the nuclear power program. Of the two minority parties, the Communists were in support of France's strong nuclear posture, while the Socialists were divided on the issue. Following the elections, with the Socialists now in the majority, an intense and heated national debate ensued which lasted from June to September of 1981. In October 1981, the Socialists presented their energy proposal to the Parliament for a vote. Regarding the nuclear power issue, there were two prevailing options to be decided: to essentially terminate the program upon completion of projects in progress, or to continue a strong nuclear power development posture that included continuation of the fast breeder development. The result of this vote was that the nuclear effort received its first majority vote to continue national support. Since then, there has been no problem, according to Dr. Vendryes. In fact, the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Mauroy, has taken an active role in policy related matters associated with the program.

Dr. Vendryes made some reference to the La Hague operation, noting that it is the largest reprocessing plant in the world. France reprocesses all its spent fuel and vitrifies the fission products. He noted that this may become a big issue when they have to consider the next plant after Super Phenix. People there are still sensitive to the waste disposal problem, because this waste occupies such a relatively large volume in a country where most land is at a premium. Thus, final disposal of both high and low-level waste still remains a problem. Dr. Vendryes believes, based on his personal inquiries, that the chief concern of those in opposition to the breeder is that it prolongs the nuclear power option well into the future.

Mrs. Bouquard then asked him if the U.S. could buy breeder technology from France when it is needed here. In Dr. Vendryes' opinion, this would be a mistake. He again argued that the U.S. spends more money than France does on its breeder technology development program. The U.S., he said, needs to build a demonstration plant and a reprocessing facility so that the program can be focused and rendered meaningful to potential users, suppliers and others. The U.S. "needs to revitalize its fast breeder program." The CRBR design has been reviewed and improved over the years, even though delays have been imposed on the project. He made some additional strong arguments in support of our CRBR effort, noting that even though Super Phenix is not considered by French engineers to be the ultimate design, it is needed to understand safety and engineering aspects better. Such under-

standing cannot be gained without actually constructing and operating a plant. He suggested also that using the information derived from CRBR, we could perhaps work together to develop the best systems for the future.

Mr. Brown asked Dr. Vendryes if there was any U.S. contractor involvement in the multinational agreements on Super Phenix. The answer was that to the best of his knowledge—no; at least there was no major U.S. involvement. He then proceeded to describe the multinational agreement on Super Phenix in some detail. The principals in this arrangement are France (51%), Italy (33%), and Germany (17%). There are some management problems (e.g., any decision must be made jointly), but on the whole the arrangement has worked fairly well. Some features of the agreement are as follows:

All partners have full access to data and plant operation experience.

The three countries receive a share of the generated electricity in proportion to their percentage contribution to project.

The various participants share, also proportionately, in equipment contracts. This has produced some serious constraints on deliverable equipment and schedules.

Even with such a complex arrangement, the division of labor and collaboration has worked.

Finally, Mr. Morrison inquired as to whether FFTF capabilities would be of use to the French program. Dr. Vendryes responded that FFTF schedules are geared toward U.S. program needs. If France were to use this facility, they would want to control projects to meet their needs. He did not think that this arrangement would be possible at this time. ●

THE FAIR PRACTICES IN AUTOMOBILE PRODUCTS ACT

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a growing number of my colleagues in the House in cosponsoring the Fair Practices in Automobile Products Act. As someone who has long supported an enlightened free trade policy, I do not take this action casually. But, we cannot ignore the fact that our U.S. automobile industry is rapidly yielding its markets to foreign producers. Since 1978, the percentage of foreign sales in the U.S. market has increased from 17.7 percent to over 27 percent currently.

The effects of this trend are far-reaching. As sales continue to decline, hundreds of thousands of U.S. auto workers have been permanently put out of work. Auto production facilities have continued to close as the rate of capacity utilization in the U.S. auto industry continues to hover below 50 percent. Unless we soon take action to preserve a U.S. auto industry, we may very likely soon be without one.

The threat of total erosion of this country's capacity to produce automobiles demands our serious attention and consideration of extraordinary

measures such as that being proposed in H.R. 5133. The auto industry is a key linkage industry that is central to almost every aspect of both our civilian and defense industrial productive capacity. Rubber, glass, steel, and many other critical industries depend upon the existence of a viable American automobile industry.

I am persuaded that a domestic content law can positively contribute to the problems facing the automobile industry for several reasons. First, we must address this problem without further delay. A recent report issued by the National Research Council appropriately confirms this.

The U.S. automobile industry is in a crisis. Vigorous import competition, drastic shifts in consumer preferences, and anemic final sales combined to make 1980 and 1981 two of the most difficult years in the industry's history.

The study goes on further to point out that the future prospects for recovery are uncertain.

If the industry is to survive, the next five years will see wrenching changes in its productive and financial base as new product technologies are introduced, manufacturing plants are retooled, and new relations are established among management, labor, and government.

There are other available options for dealing with the crisis in our automobile industry. I can conceive of even more positive options. Unfortunately, there appears to be little resolve to seriously pursue them on the part of this administration through international negotiation with our trading partners or domestic policies. In addition, there is no other policy option realistically available to Congress in the short term.

Earlier this year, I wrote letters to several of the key congressional leaders on this subject, as well as key administrative trade officials urging them to work together to pursue alternatives to imposition of a domestic content requirement on automobiles. However, neither a coordinated nor a serious effort has been forthcoming to deal with the massive unemployment and erosion of our automobile productive capability in response to my concern.

Second, the fundamental structural adjustment which will be needed to insure a healthy auto industry over the long term will take time. The effects of the current recession on auto industry efforts to achieve this adjustment have been devastating. The lack of a clear and specific national policy to help facilitate this adjustment is also contributing to the erosion of the auto industry. Continuity in the economy will be necessary to maintain the kind of environment to permit successful structural adjustment. A content requirement can provide this continuity.

Third, I am particularly concerned with the increasing tendency on the

part of major U.S. car manufacturers to move to foreign out-sourcing of components and parts for their cars. If this trend continues, the vision of only two or three world automobile companies in the future may be closer than we believe. Certainly the recent emphasis on talks regarding a joint venture between General Motors and Toyota for the manufacture of small cars are indicative of such a movement. I believe that were this to occur, it would be extremely unfortunate for our economy and seriously handicap our ability to compete effectively in many, many areas of industrial production.

Four, the threat or actual imposition of such a requirement by the United States would certainly demonstrate to our trading competitors the U.S. resolve to take strong action when critical U.S. interests are threatened by the trade policies of our international partners. In my opinion, we have been all too lax in our pursuit of a firm and tough international trade policy. As a result, we have often done serious damage to the ability of many of our most important industries to remain competitive. While imposition of a domestic content requirement per se would be a departure from past U.S. foreign trade policies, such a requirement is not unprecedented on the part of many of our trading partners who maintain content and/or quota requirements on a variety of products, including cars.

All this notwithstanding, I also continue to have some concerns about the impact such a content requirement might have on the incentive over the long term for U.S. auto firms to modernize and compete. As a result, I believe that the House should consider attaching a sunset provision to the content requirement, or develop a scheme to insure maximum reinvestment of profits by U.S. auto firms in their domestic operations.

At the outset of this debate I had additional concerns over the feasibility of meeting the size of the percentage content requirement that was contained in the original legislation. Since that time, however, this percentage requirement has been made more realistic in redrafted versions of the bill.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we need to strengthen our international trade policy. No longer can we afford to blindly pledge allegiance to a free-trade doctrine when other nations clearly do not do so when their vital interests are at stake. Movement of the content bill can contribute to strengthening our resolve in this area of national policy.

Our domestic auto industry is in serious trouble. I challenge the Administration to propose an effective alternative to this proposed legislation.

For several months now, I have advocated the development of a national industrial strategy based on development of a consensus between labor, management, Government, and the public interest for both troubled and growth industries. This would also require strengthening our international trade policy. I remain committed to the continued development of such an economic policy for the coming decade and intend to continue to develop other options for assisting the auto industry as a part of these efforts.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO LT. FRANK JOSEPH STEVENS, OF PATERSON, N.J., DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN, ESTEEMED PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER, AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 24, the residents of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join with Local No. 265 of the P.B.A. in testimony to the outstanding public service rendered by one of our most esteemed public safety officers, distinguished citizen and good friend, Lt. Frank Joseph Stevens, of Paterson, N.J., who has announced his retirement as lieutenant of detectives of the Passaic County Prosecutor's Office.

Mr. Speaker, as Lieutenant Stevens retires from his law enforcement career, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in deep appreciation of all of his good works and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife Naomi (nee Brooks); his sister, Kathlyn Stevens Conlon, and family.

Lieutenant Stevens has indeed earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us for the quality of his leadership and highest standards of excellence in seeking to achieve optimum public safety for all of our people. We applaud his 35 years and 5 months of public safety and law enforcement career pursuits in service to our people.

Mr. Speaker, in 1947, Frank served as a fireman for the city of Paterson, N.J., and in December 1947, he was fondly referred to as one of the "Blizzard Cops" appointed by Mayor Furrey to the Paterson Police Department. In October 1951, he was appointed to the Paterson Police Detective Bureau where he was promoted to sergeant in 1956, and 2 years later, on April 1, 1958, was appointed to the Passaic County Prosecutor's Office. He attained his present high office of public trust as lieutenant in April 1976.

Lieutenant Stevens is a lifetime resident of the city of Paterson in my congressional district and served overseas with the U.S. Marine Corps in World War II. He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in June 1942, and served our country with distinction as a sergeant in the Asiatic Pacific and Philippines. He received his honorable discharge in October 1945.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his lifetime, Frank has forged ahead with dedication, devotion, and sincerity of purpose in combating crime and protecting the life of our people. He was the recipient of the New Jersey State PBA's highest Award of Valor in September 1951 and has received many decorations for his valiant courage and heroic deeds performed at great risk and violent danger to his personal well-being. Among some of his major commendations are the following exemplary citations of merit and esteem that he received from the most prestigious Board of Police and Fireman: Capture of murderer (armed) Tom Carino; capture of holdup man (Peter Poth); capture of Mutt-Jeff holdup man; and capture of Eugene Ali when Ed Post was shot (cat-burglar).

We applaud Frank's knowledge, training, hard work, and personal commitment that has enabled him to achieve the fullest confidence and strongest support of his fellow-officers and the people of our community. He has always applied the most sophisticated and advanced techniques of his profession.

Lieutenant Stevens has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs and we commend the quality of his professional expertise and leadership endeavors for over three decades in the vanguard of our public safety officers.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of our way of life here in America and I am pleased to have the opportunity to call your attention to his lifetime of outstanding public service.

As Lieutenant Stevens retires his official leadership badge of courage and valor, I respectfully seek this national recognition of his contribution to our country in placing others above self in providing safety on the streets, security in the home, and optimum public safety for all of our people. We do indeed salute a great American—the Honorable Frank Joseph Steven of Paterson, N.J.—for his contribution to the quality of life for the people of our community, State and Nation.●

REPRESENTATIVES MOFFETT, DINGELL, AND RODINO INTRODUCE RESOLUTION TO CREATE A SELECT COMMITTEE ON REINDUSTRIALIZATION

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today—with our friends, committee chairmen RODINO and DINGELL—a resolution to create a House Select Committee on Reindustrialization. The committee would work for 1 year, beginning with the 98th Congress, to conduct a thorough study of American industry. At the conclusion of this period, the committee would report the results of its investigation to the House for possible legislative action.

The Reagan economic program of tax and budget cuts has failed markedly to deal with the deeply seated economic problems which plague our industries and Nation.

The program ignores the issues of skill shortages in professions as diverse as computer science to mechanics.

The program ignores the problems of scarce capital for small business.

The program does nothing to increase exports or to deal with unfair foreign trade products.

The program has done nothing to increase lagging steel production despite the fact that our mills are running at 40-percent capacity.

The program pleads poverty at a time when our infrastructure—the bridges, ports, highways, railroads of this Nation—are in shocking disrepair.

All of the committees in the House have legislative jurisdictions which can attack the discrete segments of these problems. But there does not exist a forum for discussing the issues which cross committee jurisdictions. And, there is no central policy panel within the Congress that can build the coalition needed to push through a comprehensive program to deal with these issues.

Because of this, our select committee will draw from nine major policy-making committees members with expertise in these areas. It will examine the issues for a year, and then issue a report. The members will return to their committees and develop a legislative program, where appropriate, to deal with the problems identified in the study. And the result will be a substantial and workable alternative to the economic program which has produced little besides unemployment, high interest rates, high deficits, and no hope.

Printed below is a brief factsheet on our proposal. I would urge the support

and cosponsorship of this measure by all my House colleagues.

**FACT SHEET—SELECT COMMITTEE ON
REINDUSTRIALIZATION
POLICY**

The resolution would create a Select Committee on Reindustrialization. It would begin work at the start of the 98th Congress. The resolution provides for a year long investigation and would require the Committee to report legislative recommendations to the House by December 31, 1983.

The Committee would be directed to conduct a thorough study of the condition of U.S. industry focusing on—whether capital markets generate sufficient investment; what education programs should be emphasized in the 1980's; whether existing training or retraining programs are adequate; the skill areas in which personnel shortages can be forecast; whether industry can improve its adoption of new technologies; the causes of America's lagging productivity; how to address our deteriorating infrastructure; the role of small business in reindustrialization; whether the tax code should be revised to increase investment; what needs to be done about the housing, steel and auto firms; whether existing trade laws adequately protect domestic industry against unfair foreign practices; the proper role for exports in reindustrialization.

MEMBERSHIP

A total of 27 Members will be appointed from the House Committees on Banking, Education, Energy, Government Operations, Judiciary, Public Works, Science, Small Business and Ways and Means.

POINTS TO REMEMBER

1. The Committee will not have special legislative jurisdiction; rather, its role will complement the activities of the legislative Committees by providing a forum for discussion of issues which naturally cross the existing Committee jurisdictions.
2. The existence of the Committee will help publicize problems and solutions which fall outside the narrow and unworkable policies of the Reagan Administration.

SPONSORS

Congressman Toby Moffett; House Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino; House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman John Dingell.●

**TRIBUTE TO TWO
PENNSYLVANIA SCOUTS**

HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring two Boy Scouts from the 11th District of Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent. These two Scouts have recently received the highest Scouting award, the coveted Eagle Scout Award.

Mark A. Harmon, 18, son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Harmon, will be entering the U.S. Marine Corps this fall. As an active member of a Danville, Pa., Scout troop, he provided volunteer services for an area nursing home facility. He is a graduate of Danville Senior High School.

Jeffrey B. Hall, 14, son of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Hall, is a sophomore at Dallas High School, where he is an honor student involved in wrestling and football. He is a member of Trinity United Presbyterian Church in Dallas.

I commend the troop's Scout leaders for spurring these young men on to such an outstanding achievement, and I join parents, friends, and members of the communities in wishing these young men equal success in their future endeavors.●

**CONGRATULATIONS TO MS.
SARAH ALICE WRIGHT**

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Ms. Sarah Alice Wright of St. Albans, N.Y., who recently received the coveted Candace Award of the National Coalition of Black Women. This significant national organization of 15,000 members named only 17 recipients nationwide, and Ms. Wright was the only winner from New York. Because of the great honor and prestige associated with the Candace Award, I would like to share the following article written by Stephen McFarland of the New York Daily News:

ST. ALBANS WOMAN WINS A NATIONAL AWARD
(By Stephen McFarland)

Sarah Alice Wright of St. Albans, national executive director of the Young Women's Christian Association, has been named one of 17 national winners of the annual Candace Award of the National Coalition of 100 Black Women. Wright is the only winner from the New York area this year.

"It's an honor to receive this award," Wright said yesterday. "because 100 Black Women is a very significant national organization, but I was really quite surprised. I was not aware that I was under consideration for the award."

The National Coalition of 100 Black Women is an advocacy organization of socially active black women drawn from all walks of life that seeks the "empowerment of black women," according to Jewel Jackson McCabe of 100 Black Women. It has 15,000 members in 19 states and the District of Columbia. The Candace (pronounced "can-DAY-say") Award takes its name from the ancient Ethiopian title for queen or empress.

The award, which is being presented for the first time this year, recognizes achievement in eight fields of endeavor. Wright is receiving her award in the field of community service. There are two recipients in each of the eight fields and a special Distinguished Service Award that has been won by Rachel Robinson, widow of Jackie Robinson, the first black baseball player in the major leagues.

Wright, who was born in Harrisburg, Pa., has been professionally associated with the YWCA for 30 years. She received a bache-

lor's degree from the Pennsylvania State College at West Chester, a master's in education from the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia and a master's in social work from the University of Pittsburgh.

She began her career with the YWAC in Youngstown, Ohio, and, after coming to New York, served as associate executive director before being named national executive director in 1974. Wright is the first black woman to hold that post.

Wright, who admits to being "60ish," said that in the 1950s and '60s she was active in the Program for Youth of the National Board of the YWCA. "I guess you could say that my first love is working with young people," she said. She also teaches Sunday school and is an active member at Christ Memorial Baptist Church in St. Albans, of which her husband, Emmett, is pastor.

The Candace Award program has been made possible by a subsidy from Bailey's Original Irish Cream Liqueur. The awards themselves have been donated by Avon through Tiffany, the Fifth Ave. jewelry concern, which is an Avon subsidiary. The awards are in crystal and depict the head of a black woman.

They will be formally presented at ceremonies on Sept. 30 in the Temple of Dendur of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Ave. at 81st St., Manhattan.●

TURKEY

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech on the House floor, I included a statement relating to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. We have all been concerned with the outstanding historical role of the Eastern Orthodox Church which is headquartered in Istanbul, Turkey. Various issues were raised concerning this report.

I was delighted to hear from the Turkish Ambassador to the United States, Sukru Elekdag. He expressed a full and deeply concerned voice in support of religious freedom with the strong belief of Turkey in complete religious freedom.

I would like to include this statement to me by Ambassador Sukru Elekdag of Turkey.

Allow me to inform you that all Turkish citizens and existing religious institutions in Turkey enjoy religious freedom. Historically, Turkish people have traditionally been tolerant towards other religions and nations. Turkish people are proud of this exemplary tolerance and the privilege of Turkey to have the historical sites of the principal religions. The Ecumenical Patriarchate, a Turkish religious institution, is also under the guarantee of the Turkish Constitution and laws.

The Patriarchate, as a religious institution, discharges its duties without any restraint whatsoever. The Patriarch and the personnel of the Patriarchate as a whole enjoy all the fundamental rights and liberties recognized in the Constitution for all the Turkish citizens. The Patriarch himself,

had the opportunity to state on several occasions to world public opinion that Turkish citizens belonging to Christian minority groups were under no repression in a secular state where all citizens enjoy religious freedom.

In 1979, during his visit to Turkey, His Holiness Pope John Paul II himself testified to this and said (as translated from French): "Today you Christian residents of Turkey are living within a modern state which respects faiths without identifying itself with any and which gives to all the freedom of expressing their belief." ●

REDBOOK REPORTS ON HEALTH RISKS OF FORMALDEHYDE FOAM INSULATION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the October 1982 issue of Redbook magazine provides a fascinating and inspiring first person account of how one Michigan family fought against and overcame the health hazards of urea formaldehyde foam insulation.

On May 18 and 19, 1982, the Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, which I chair, held hearings into the Federal response to the health risks of formaldehyde in home insulation, mobile homes, and in other consumer products. On August 4, the Subcommittee on Safety Issues Affecting Small Businesses of the House Committee on Small Business also examined the formaldehyde issue.

Mr. Speaker, legislation is pending in the House, including my bill H.R. 6524, which would, in various ways, compensate the victims of formaldehyde offgassing. The health hazards associated with formaldehyde are extremely serious and widespread throughout our Nation. In many ways, the Federal Government "endorsed" the use of formaldehyde foam insulation. It is now the Government's responsibility to assist those whose health and economic well-being have been jeopardized by formaldehyde products.

Redbook magazine should be congratulated for bringing home to the American people in such a human way the tribulation and triumph of a family threatened by a dangerous chemical product. The text of the Redbook article appears below.

[From Redbook Magazine, October 1982]

OUR HOUSE WAS ENDANGERING OUR HEALTH (By Diane Burton Rabb)

My husband Chris and I couldn't quite believe we were the owners of a brand-new yellow Cape Cod. It was our first house, and though the building process had been carefully orchestrated, we still found it hard to realize it was ours.

We'd planned our home with an eye toward the future—a huge yard and a vege-

table garden, bedrooms assigned to future children, a school within walking distance. Built in the wake of the energy crisis, it also had energysaving features most people hadn't even begun to consider. For example, we installed most of the windows on the south side of the house so that we could take advantage of the sun's warmth during our cold Michigan winters. Central to the plan was a new kind of wall insulation that seemed far superior to anything else on the market. Even at nearly double the cost of fiber glass, we were certain urea-formaldehyde foam insulation would be of enormous benefit in that northern climate.

It certainly was strange-looking stuff. A crowd of neighbors gathered as the installers hauled long hoses from the truck into the unfinished house. They filled every wall cavity with a white, powerful-smelling material that spewed out like shaving cream and later dried to a crumbly, spongelike consistency. The fumes were overwhelming, and for several weeks my allergy-prone sister couldn't walk upstairs without having her eyes smart. But by the time we moved in, the house had only a pleasant "new" smell we attributed to fresh paint and wood. Months later we still remarked on our house's newness with pride, savoring the smell every time we came home after a few days' absence.

It was not until our daughter was born, three years later, that we began to suspect the persistent odor might mean that something was very wrong. One evening early in the winter, I was half listening to the news and my attention was caught by a story about a family forced to move from a trailer insulated with urea-formaldehyde foam. The fumes were unbearable. The little girl had cancer. Was there a connection? I looked at Chris, whom I'd hurriedly called in. "That's different. It was a trailer," he said. But that moment a nagging, unspoken fear took root in both of us.

Our concern grew into anxiety a few weeks later when we read a newspaper article citing the growing numbers of complaints from homeowners whose houses were insulated with urea-formaldehyde foam. Tests performed with rats suggested potential health hazards such as tumors and Massachusetts had already banned the material. Yet, other scientists insisted that it would be impossible for human beings to endure the level of fumes necessary to cause tumors in the rats. Still, tumors. Hidden in the assurance was a frightening possibility.

We had already experienced the sinus problems and irritations the article listed as possible effects of formaldehyde. We'd always blamed them on Michigan's fickle weather, but now our symptoms took on a new importance. The thought of our newborn daughter's spending 24 hours a day in an environment that could jeopardize her health made our tight, energy-efficient home seem like a prison. Without telling our friends or each other, Chris and I each began to scout our favorite areas for "for sale" signs.

Some days the whole idea that formaldehyde could be dangerous seemed ridiculous. My father, a chemist with a healthy disrespect for cancer scares, didn't think we should worry. My husband's family voiced its concern. Friends offered a sympathetic ear. I wanted to yell out loud, "Why doesn't someone just tell us this is silly!"

But no one did, including the Michigan Department of Public Health, which began offering an air-testing service [now discontinued] for those who suspected a formalde-

hyde problem in their homes. The man from the state put testing equipment in an upstairs bedroom and in the family room, and left it to collect air samples for three hours. He told me about a family that had tried pumping ammonia into the insulation to bind the irritant chemically; another family had been forced to move into a trailer behind its home, and later built a room to live in separate from the house. As he left he offered sympathetically, "I hope we don't find anything. Especially with a baby in the house."

I thanked him, assuring him he probably wouldn't. But my confidence was shaky.

For weeks we awaited the test results. My last hope sank as I walked away from the mailbox, letter in hand. "We've got it." I said quietly to Chris as I walked into the house. "Higher in our bedroom than down here." I felt panicky as I thought of our daughter's room, next to ours. It was smaller, and often seemed stuffy.

Chris tried to put the letter into perspective. "Look how small the levels are," he said, and he was right. The figures were infinitesimal, measured in parts per million. We had no idea what they meant. But they shouldn't have been there at all.

The letter said that it couldn't be concluded that exposure at our levels caused health problems, but warned that sensitized individuals could suffer adverse effects at levels below those detectable by smell or eye irritation. Sensitization could happen immediately or after months of exposure. The Public Health Advisory accompanying the letter included a health-effects disclosure that listed possible eye, nose and throat irritation, coughing, dizziness, nausea and other symptoms. It warned, among other things, that formaldehyde gas could continue to be released over a long period of time. Worst of all, in some cases the gas could not be controlled by "ventilation or other inexpensive means." There was a doctor's form attached to the letter, to be returned to the state. We could hardly believe it. This was serious.

We became increasingly unable to cope with the problem, alternating between periods of intense anxiety and slumps of apathy. When one of us was ready to take action, the other retreated, pretending nothing was wrong. We seldom talked about it, and as the problem began to pervade our every thought, we hardly talked at all. We began driving around endlessly, looking for houses for sale, too numb to discuss how we were to find another house like ours when inflation and spiraling mortgage costs meant we could no longer afford it. We didn't talk about how we could sell a house with a serious fault. We never mentioned the immensity of what we would be giving up, or how dearly we loved our house, much of which we had built ourselves. Emotionally we had already deserted it.

Later in the spring the Consumer Product Safety Commission replied to my request for information with a copy of their proposed ban on urea-formaldehyde foam insulation. There were 22 pages of figures and conclusions drawn from a two-year inhalation study on mice and rats, and it was worse than we could have imagined. It stated that even people who were exposed to formaldehyde and didn't suffer acute illness still risked developing cancer. Most frightening of all was the conclusion that there is no exposure level "below which it is certain that formaldehyde will not induce cancer." The only reliable remedy: "physically removing the product from the walls

of the building," at a cost of thousands of dollars.

The information jarred us out of our apathy. We consulted a lawyer. He thought we might have a case, but in the absence of any serious present illness or disability we would be able to sue only for the cost of replacement, and the fight might be expensive. He suggested that we first talk with the local installer, expressing our concern and firmly suggesting the company take responsibility.

The installer was sympathetic but didn't feel the results of the study were conclusive. No, the product was no longer being used; no, they hadn't had any other complaints out of 2,800 homes (we knew of problems in others); no, they weren't responsible. If we wanted an air purifier, he'd lend us one. We felt like frightened children who had just been offered a night light. Chris was furious when he hung up the phone. "I hope he has it in his house," he fumed.

The lawyer had also told us we shouldn't sell the house without a full disclosure. If the new owner proved sensitive to formaldehyde, we could be liable. Admission of the problem would certainly damage the selling price. And it looked as if the cost of any attempts to remedy the problem ourselves would come out of our own pockets. Which ever way we turned, we lost.

Meanwhile there seemed to be a new and growing realization on every level of the hazards of formaldehyde. When Dad, our last remaining advocate for staying in the house, urged us not to spend another winter there, we knew we had to remove the insulation at any cost.

For the first time we began to open up to neighbors and friends. Almost miraculously, the casual discussions that followed generated countless suggestions, as well as commitments of labor and equipment. The contractor building a house across the street was interested in taking on the job during a slack period, letting Chris and a volunteer crew provide the labor. A call to the original siding contractor led us to speculate that it might be possible to pull off and reuse the siding and Styrofoam-board insulation. Buoyed for the first time in months, we decided to go ahead.

On a hot August morning, refrigerator well stocked for the band of friends, relatives and neighbors assembled outside, the project began. Every piece of siding was carefully removed, numbered, and laid out on the lawn like a jigsaw puzzle. The foam sheathing was taken off and carefully stacked. The white insulation broke into chunks and crumbled, littering the yard and swirling like snow as it was stuffed into huge bags. The workers wore face masks, but that didn't keep particles of foam from covering their hair, their clothing and their sweating skin. The foam came out easily, but every stud had to be carefully scrubbed with a stiff brush to remove the residue. It was unnerving to watch the house being stripped bare—a sudden thunderstorm could have meant disaster.

In just one long, arduous weekend, two sides of the house had been stripped, cleaned out, reinsulated and put back together without a single telltale mark. The whole project took three weekends. Because volunteers supplied the labor, the contractor charged us only for his time and materials, bringing the total cost to a little over \$1,000. (We have since spent an additional \$500 to remove some interior walls to get at insulation inaccessible from the outside). We had received an initial rough estimate of

\$6,000 for the entire job, so we were thrilled. Recycled materials and volunteer labor saved us thousands. We consider it our great good fortune to have had friends and neighbors who rallied behind us, working up to ten hours a day in sweltering weather without ever making us feel this was anything but the most vital project in the world. To them we owe our health and peace of mind, as well as the spirit of sharing that has pervaded our neighborhood ever since, making us doubly glad we were able to stay.

We'd decided even before we tackled the project not to take legal action. We were afraid that if we lost, we would no longer have the money to remove the material from the walls. Afterward, just being free of the problem was like a brand-new start, one we didn't want to muddle with the anxiety and expense of a court battle. But we're still angry at having had to pay twice over for our energysaving efforts; furious that the product was placed on the market without testing; impatient with the snail's pace of action to establish whether there truly was a hazard; concerned for the countless families for whom there is no simple solution. And sometimes, in the wee hours, I'm unable to shake the tiny bur of anxiety that says there may still be health effects to come. My husband and I have realized for the first time just how alone the consumer can really be. And as new parents, how vast our responsibilities are.

And yet, some very good things came out of our experience. We have a clean, odor-free house. Most of our symptoms have lessened or vanished. We've come to recognize the strong network of people we can count on. And ultimately we have the satisfaction of knowing that as consumers and as parents, we were able to stand up and take action against what seemed at first an insurmountable threat to our family's well-being. ●

BANKRUPTCY DILEMMA

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, almost 4 years ago, in the final hours of the 95th Congress, this House approved the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-598), designed to extensively amend the Nation's bankruptcy laws and upgrade the bankruptcy courts. Legislative approval followed months of debate among House Members and weeks of negotiations with the Senate over the kind of court that should be created for resolving bankruptcy law cases. The issue was relatively simple: Should bankruptcy courts be established as supporting units within the U.S. district courts or as independent separate entities with a general jurisdiction grant of authority fully equal to the district courts? The Congress answered that the former view was preferable. The Supreme Court has now called at least part of that judgment into question.

Advocates of both arrangements regarded the bankruptcy courts as "specialized courts" designed to handle a

type of "specialized cases"—bankruptcy cases. Those of us who believed they should remain supporting units within the district courts felt that the "specialized" nature of the work did not require conferring authority which would permit bankruptcy judges to render final decisions in anti-trust, criminal, and civil rights cases. Those supporting expansive jurisdiction argued that the bankruptcy courts' work was of vital enough importance to require a conferral of the full range of Federal judicial power.

The House first rejected general jurisdiction for the bankruptcy courts on October 28, 1977, but later approved it on February 1, 1978 (H.R. 8200, 95th Cong.). The Senate, in September of 1978, passed a bill (S. 2266) in which a supporting-unit-arrangement was created. The compromise between the two bodies which was finally sent to the President for approval retained bankruptcy courts as supporting units within the district court structure, but conferred upon them expansive jurisdictional authority equivalent to the district courts in an allegedly narrow field of practice.

On June 28, 1982, in *Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., Inc., et al.* U.S. 50 U.S.L.W. 4892 (Nos. 81-150 and 81-546, June 28, 1982), the Supreme Court of the United States concluded that at least a portion of the compromise arrangement approved by Congress in 1978 is unconstitutional. The Court stayed its judgment until October 4 to "afford Congress an opportunity to reconstitute the bankruptcy courts or to adopt other valid means of adjudication * * *."

On August 19, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered reported a bill, H.R. 6978, which would "restructure" the bankruptcy courts as courts of general jurisdiction under article III of the Constitution. The bill may be before this House next week. I do not intend to vote for it. It is the wrong way to respond to the Supreme Court's decision.

In the Northern Pipeline case, the Court held that powers conferred in one section of the 1978 act could not be constitutionally exercised by bankruptcy judges. According to the certiorari petition, the issue before the Court was:

Whether the assignment by Congress to bankruptcy judges of the jurisdiction granted in Sec. 241(a) of the Bankruptcy Act of 1978, 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1471 . . . violates Article III of the Constitution.

The Court concluded that language in section 1471 as created by section 241(a) of the act conferring jurisdiction over "all civil proceedings arising under title 11 or arising in or related to cases under title 11" was not constitutionally valid. Because the 1978 act did not create bankruptcy courts as

courts under article III of the Constitution—courts whose judges would hold office for life with an absolute guarantee that their salaries of office could not be reduced—the Court held that jurisdiction over all civil proceedings “arising in or related to cases under title 11” is invalid. Whether the Court went further is open to a serious legal dispute.

Realistically, one way Congress can easily correct that jurisdictional defect directly is by amending section 241(a) of the 1978 act. That action would not cost any money at all, and would immediately provide clarification for the bar and business community. In a report filed on September 10 with every Member of the House, the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended precisely that course of action. The conference also specifically recommended that a restructuring of the bankruptcy courts in the manner provided in H.R. 6978 be rejected by Congress as unnecessary, disruptive of sound principles of court administration, and immediately and potentially very expensive. I commend to the attention of all members the conference's analysis and its cost estimates which anticipate immediate increases in expenditures of at least \$33 million.

We only have a few weeks left in which to take action. We should act to reassure the public. But we should not rush to judgment by creating an entirely new court structure. Those persons urging adoption of H.R. 6978 tell us bankruptcy judges' work consists of thousands of contested and complex cases. The Judicial Conference tells us that is not a correct assessment. The Conference claims that cases of the type involved in the Marathon case involve only about 5 percent of the bankruptcy filings.

Proponents of H.R. 6978 argue that a new court system is the only way to avoid costly litigation to resolve questions of jurisdictional validity. Yet that is not certain. Any competent lawyer can almost always find a way to raise a jurisdictional question. A new court structure will not eliminate jurisdictional issues; it will generate as many questions as it answers. We literally have no idea, and the Judicial Conference candidly admits that it has no idea how much work will be created for appellate courts by H.R. 6978. How many more judgeships can we create? H.R. 6978 alone will add 227 new life-tenured judges to the more than 1,000 judges already in the Federal courts. I fear we are rushing heedlessly down a road to creating more and more judges and authorizing more and more appropriations for supporting personnel and courthouses, without realizing what the final costs to our court structure and our budget will be.

In sum, we should act responsibly. We could clarify jurisdiction as the Ju-

dicial Conference has recommended. I have introduced such a measure today. If problems arise, we can later correct errors easily. Alternatively, we could establish a small number; for example, 15 to 20, of article III bankruptcy judges to hear the cases that require adjudication by a life-tenured judge. Yet a final option is to seek a further stay of the Supreme Court's October 4, 1982, mandate.

If we create a huge new court system like that proposed in H.R. 6872 and then we find 2 years from now that the system is not needed, we cannot correct the damage. Those judges will be there for life. The new court structure is not a proven necessity. If it turns out to be an error, the cost of the mistake will be tremendous and the error will apparently be irreversible.

I noted at the beginning of this statement the origin of our problem: a hasty compromise at the end of the 95th Congress. That effort to compromise then created this problem. Let us not repeat the mistakes of the past.●

GOLD, SILVER, AND BRONZE FOR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, athletes from the U.S. Virgin Islands recently participated in the Central American and Caribbean games (CAC) that took place in Cuba. These athletes competed in a variety of events including swimming, boxing, and wind surfing.

Even though the Virgin Islands may be small in size, a number of outstanding athletes have come forth from our shores. The young people who have competed in the CAC games were quite successful in their endeavors, winning a total of two gold, five silver, and four bronze medals—the largest number of medals won by a Virgin Islands group in an international competition.

Shelly Cramer and Jodie Lawaetz had outstanding performances in the swimming competitions. Shelly, a senior at the University of South Carolina, captured the gold medal in the 200-meter butterfly event and established a new record 2:18:54 in the event. She collected a total of six medals during the games. Jodie, who is 16 years of age and a senior at Good Hope High School in St. Croix, won a silver medal in the 400-meter individual medley and a bronze medal in the 100-meter butterfly event.

A gold medal was won by Kenneth Klein in the wind surfing event. James Larson, who serves in the U.S. Navy, was awarded a silver medal in the boxing competition. A bronze medal

was presented to Clifton Charles Wells in his particular event.

These outstanding young people represented the U.S. Virgin Islands and the United States in a manner of which we can all be proud during the course of the Central American and Caribbean games held in Cuba. I am sure that my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating and showing appreciation to these athletes for a job well done.●

JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY ACTION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Journal of Community Action is only a few years old, but already it has established itself as one of the leading publications in the field of community economic development, neighborhood government, and Federal, State, and local relations. Edited by two veteran community organizers and analysts, Nelson Rosenbaum, formerly of the Urban Institute, and Milton Kotler, founder of the National Association of Neighborhoods, the journal is fast becoming an indispensable source of news, analysis, and ideas on community life.

Each issue contains research reports, policy perspectives, and a section entitled, “Notes From the Field,” which surveys the most innovative experiments in community action taking place across the Nation. To illustrate its high standards of journalism, I am attaching for the Members' review an article that appeared in the January/February issue of this year. Lawrence Bailis' article, “Community-Based Organizations and CETA,” is an important contribution to understanding the role of community organizations in job training and employment programs. Excerpts from the article follow:

COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND CETA

(By Lawrence N. Bailis)

As is almost always the case, federally funded employment and training programs are now at a critical crossroads. During the past fifteen years, supporters of these programs have seen expenditures for the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and its predecessors grow from less than a billion dollars a year to more than \$10 billion, only to see them reduced sharply to less than one-third that size, with further cuts likely.

The growth of these programs has been accompanied by the rise of non-profit organizations that claim to serve all or portions of the client community, groups known as “community based organizations” (CBOs) in the CETA parlance. Many nationwide as well as local unaffiliated community groups

were created largely in response to the availability of funding for what were then known as manpower programs (and are now known as employment and training programs since the term "manpower" is currently considered a sexist word). Other community groups had been in existence long before the creation of manpower programs but used the CETA program and its predecessors as an opportunity to widen the range of services that they were providing to the community.

During the past decade, the destinies of the employment and training programs and the CBOs that have provided services in them have become increasingly intertwined. Aided in part by federal regulations that encourage utilization of community groups, CBOs have received as much as one-fifth of the monies allocated to training adults, and the bulk of the monies for certain youth employment and training programs.

The importance of community based organizations to CETA has outweighed their share of total funding dollars. The documented successes of certain community groups in reaching, training, and employing disadvantaged Americans—and the political support enjoyed by many of these organizations—helped to promote the sustained growth in CETA funding. The equally well documented shortcomings in CBO management practices have, on the other hand, hurt the overall image of the program, and thereby contributed to the atmosphere that has helped to promote the recent and ongoing cutbacks.

While many CBOs have developed a broad base of public and private sector funding sources, CETA has become the primary source of funding for many others. Federal grants have helped to sustain many organizations which have become spokesmen for the disadvantaged in areas that go far beyond preparation for the world of work. The cutbacks in CETA and other federal funding sources are thus jeopardizing the viability of many community groups, and forcing almost all of them to step up their efforts to provide alternative sources of funding.

Most of the discussion about the future of federally funded employment and training programs has focused on structural issues such as whether or not the current Prime Sponsor system should be preserved, or on the roles to be played by state government, local government, and the business community. However, for the reasons outlined above, analysis of the potential roles to be played by community groups should play an important part in ongoing efforts to enact a new federally funded employment and training system to replace CETA.

FRAMEWORK FOR DECISIONMAKING

Decisions about the future role of CBOs in employment and training systems should be made on the basis of two kinds of considerations: (a) the future shape of these systems and their objectives, and (b) assessments about the ability of community-based organizations to promote achievement of these objectives as evidenced by their previous track record.

At first glance, neither of these considerations can provide clear guidance. First, while a large number of different legislative proposals have been considered, no one can be sure what federal employment and training programs of the future will look like. Second, nearly a decade of CETA research and evaluation studies has failed to provide definitive conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of CBOs as service deliv-

eries, or even more general information about what factors contribute to making an organization an effective provider of training services.

However, prudent planners cannot wait until the future is totally clear and predictable, and those who seek to affect the future do not have the luxury of waiting until all of the relevant data had been collected and analyzed. If they do wait, they will find that others have already made key decisions without ever consulting them. Therefore, now is an opportune time to review the role of CBOs in the past and reach conclusions about the role that they can play in the future.

WHITHER CETA?

Before attempting to prescribe the proper role for community based organizations in future federally funded employment and training systems, one must first address two sets of issues:

Is there likely to be any federal funding for such programs beyond the next year or two, and

If so, what are the program goals and structure likely to look like?

While it is always hazardous to make predictions on topics such as this (and doubly hazardous to put one's predictions into print where they can be so easily retrieved and reviewed), several conclusions appear justified by the contents of the legislative proposals offered by Senators Quayle and Kennedy and Representatives Hawkins and Jeffords.

First, major changes in the structure and functioning of employment and training programs seem inevitable. Even those who are happiest with the current CETA system admit that severe cutbacks are raising questions about such previously fundamental aspects of the CETA system as reliance upon local general-purpose governments representing 100,000 or more citizens as the basic planning and operational unit ("Prime Sponsor") under the system, and the importance of providing training allowances to permit low-income disadvantaged men and women to participate in training programs at all.

Beyond this, a general consensus appears to have emerged from recent Congressional hearings on CETA that the goals of the reauthorized or redesigned program should stress provision of training opportunities rather than Public Service Employment to the disadvantaged, and in particular to disadvantaged youth.

Despite these changes, the goals of future employment and training efforts are likely to resemble many of the current ones. It also seems reasonable to expect important continuities in the overall structure in which planning and service delivery takes place. Some have called for retaining the current Prime Sponsor System in which cities and counties with a population of 100,000 or more are responsible for employment and training, with the state governors responsible for portions of states that do not meet the 100,000 cutoff. Others have called for raising the population cutoff, and/or increasing the role of the governor as overseer or operator of the entire system within a state. Almost everyone seems to be calling for an increased role by the business community in planning and operating future programs. But, whichever of these or other alternatives is finally chosen, it is clear that some organization will be given responsibility for providing training and related services in a given jurisdiction. That organization will have to decide (a) whether it wishes to provide these services directly

or to subcontract for at least some of them, and (b) if they are subcontracted, whom to subcontract them to.

In short, it seems increasingly likely that there will be either government bodies or consortia including government that will be deciding what role—if any—CBOs should be playing in the planning and administration of skills training programs for disadvantaged Americans. While politics will inevitably play a role in making these decisions, empirically based evaluations of the potential and limitations of community groups can also be expected to be influential. The remainder of this article seeks to provide information that will further such planning at both the federal and local levels.

LESSONS FROM THE PAST

During the first eight fiscal years of CETA, community-based organizations have played virtually every conceivable role in the planning and delivering of employment and training services. Many Prime Sponsors, especially the larger ones, have permitted CBOs to function as comprehensive service deliverers, i.e., to perform all needed services from outreach and recruitment of trainees through provision of training and supportive services to eventual placement of clients and followup on their progress on-the-job. Other Prime Sponsors have divided responsibility for client services among a number of organizations, but have given CBOs a number of important functions to carry out.

A recent survey of utilization of CBOs among twenty Prime Sponsors revealed the extent to which CBOs provide training services in adult programs. (Urban Systems, 1979). In cases where community outreach was subcontracted, it was done exclusively by community based organizations. Nearly 80 percent of the subcontractors with responsibility for provision of counseling and related supportive services were CBOs, and more than half of the agencies that provided specialized job development and/or placement were community groups. In addition to this, nearly half of the combined outreach, intake, assessment, and classroom training responsibilities that were subcontracted were assigned to CBOs as well. CBOs were also the leading choice of Prime Sponsors to deliver so-called work experience (on-the-job programs in which the primary benefit is developing work habits rather than skill acquisition) and represented more than 40 percent of the sub-grantees with responsibility for on-the-job training.

If there were universally accepted standards of performance for community-based service deliverers and adequate data to assess their performance, one could review this past experience and decide what CBOs did best, under what circumstances, and so forth. Unfortunately, neither the standards nor the data exist, and so the lessons from the past are more dependent upon judgment than mathematical manipulation of performance data. While there are disputes about all parts of the CBO record to date, it is possible to make relatively conclusive assessments of the role of CBOs as advocates for the client community, as links between that community and the more mainstream training institutions, and as direct deliverers of classroom training services.

THE ADVOCACY ROLE

While statistics about impact of training on earnings of trainees are sometimes hard to come by, there is broad recognition of the fact that community based organizations have been playing a client advocacy role

since their initial involvement in employment and training programs. While all agencies that provide CETA services have felt pressures to "cream," i.e., to serve those who are most likely to succeed within the overall eligible group, many CBOs have apparently been relatively successful in resisting these pressures. While the employer community has incentives to press for serving those who are most likely to become model employees, CBOs have competing incentives to remind government agencies and employers alike that one cannot measure the effectiveness of programs in terms of overall placement rates and cost per placement.

The creative tension between the drive to demonstrate cost-effectiveness and the need to serve those most in need is likely to persist into the foreseeable future. While government agencies serving as Prime Sponsors or overseers of employment and training programs might try to resist pressures to cream, a review of the CETA record to date does not give one total confidence that this can be expected to occur throughout all of the decentralized components of employment and training programs across the Nation.

Given this situation, it would seem reasonable to maintain the current statutory role for CBOs in planning employment and training programs—and to consider expanding it. Care must be taken, of course, to insure that advocacy of client needs does not become distorted into advocacy for providing money for CBOs regardless of their merits. The experience with CETA to date, however, suggests that there is little reason to be concerned that CBOs will become overly influential in a planning process that is shared among government officials, business leaders, and other key actors.

LINKAGES TO THE COMMUNITY

Community based deliverers of employment and training services have been funded, in large part, to remedy the perceived failures of so-called mainstream service deliverers (such as public schools, community colleges, and proprietary schools) to serve minorities and other disadvantaged clients. While CBOs have sometimes been seen as competitors to these mainstream groups, they have also often served as the "glue" that has linked the mainstream employment and training system together with the minority and disadvantaged client community.

The history of employment and training programs is replete with examples in which community groups have successfully promoted linkages between mainstream agencies and their disadvantaged clientele through the conduct of such activities as:

Outreach to the client community that is promoted by formal and informal ties between CBO staff and potential client groups,

Intake that is promoted by the location of many CBOs directly in the neighborhoods where clients live,

Assessment of client needs that is promoted by the rapport that can be developed between CBO staff and clients, and

Direct placement of minority groups to further affirmative action goals of major employers that is promoted by all of the other three above-listed factors.

With the increased emphasis on economic development within the employment and training systems, community-based organizations have the potential to provide new forms of linkages. Perhaps the most promising of these is promoting ties between mi-

nority small businesses and larger Chambers of Commerce or Private Industry Councils.

In recent years, there has been a trend toward centralization of the functions of outreach, intake, assessment and placement, with Prime Sponsors directly carrying out these activities rather than subcontracting them to CBOs and other groups. It is widely believed that these centralized efforts are most desirable in smaller Prime Sponsors where geographic compactness and the relatively small numbers of clients permit centralized facilities to be accessible to those from outlying neighborhoods and where it is administratively feasible to carry them out in a single location. If, as seems likely, the service delivery areas of the future will be larger than the current prime sponsorships, the desirability of centralized outreach, intake, assessment, and placement will decline, and the relative attractiveness of delegating these tasks to community groups with a strong base in the neighborhoods where clients are drawn from will increase.

The above discussion provides logical arguments in favor of utilizing community groups to deliver services that link the mainstream organizations that are delivering employment and training services with the members of and organizations within the client community. But even if the logic is convincing to supporters of community groups, it is doubtful whether it will be enough to convince those with operational responsibility for future employment and training systems. Therefore, the burden of proof is likely to fall on community groups themselves to demonstrate that (a) such linkages are necessary if the overall system is to function as intended and (b) the community groups are better equipped to provide these linkage services than other organizational alternatives.

Doing so will not be easy. The CETA evaluation literature does not provide definitive conclusions on the relative advantages and disadvantages of utilizing community groups for outreach, intake and placement, as opposed to centralizing them within a single government agency. But the difficulty of the task does not diminish the need to proceed with it.

OSHA'S FIRST RULEMAKING: A BIT OF FANCY FOOTWORK?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, after more than a year of concentrating on administrative changes and standard modification, the new management of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has taken a clear first step of its own in originating regulation.

It is a half step at best or, at worst, a piece of fancy footwork that gives the dancer the appearance of moving forward while actually shuffling back, critics say.

In February 1981, in one of its first acts, the new administration pulled back a formally proposed health protection standard that was meant to

give workers useful information on dangerous chemicals in the substances they use at work. This was called the hazards identification standard and it was proposed in the closing days of Eula Bingham's administration at OSHA.

The withdrawal was accompanied by promises to proceed expeditiously with a new and equally effective standard that would be drawn according to the commandments of cost effectiveness and the other imperatives of deregulation such as performance orientation.

OSHA Under Assistant Secretary of Labor Thorne Auchter published a notice of proposed rulemaking on the promised new measure in March 1982. This is called the hazard communication standard. It is in the comment stage.

However, the changes made in the intervening year are more than the difference between identification and communication many health professionals and labor unions say.

The chief difference is in the starting point, apparently. Normally a Government agency begins rulemaking with a broad scope that often is narrowed and modified to a point of more-or-less universal acceptability in the give-and-take of the process. This one begins from a point of weakness that critics say may never be overcome.

So the criticism is that the new hazard communication standard inverts the rulemaking process that had been followed in the old hazards identification standard; that the new standard approaches worker health with an air of foot-dragging acceptance of duty rather than deep concern.

Mr. Speaker, the standard and the idea of labeling hazardous material is of deep concern to the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, of which I am chairman, and the subcommittee held 8 days of oversight hearings on it during this Congress.

American workers deal with more than 55,000 substances and compounds containing chemicals and combinations, many of which cause some early reaction and others that bury themselves in parts of the body to show up years later as cancer and nerve diseases and damaged lungs and deformed or stillborn children. Many of these substances in their containers carry only trade names and offer no information on composition or the danger they hold.

Furthermore, the 91st Congress was discussing the idea of labeling more than 10 years ago when the Occupational Safety and Health Act passed. Labeling was one of the hypothetical protections the new agency could offer. The idea was to provide a warning, to state appropriate aid in case of accident, and to establish records of who used what substance to assist in

treatment if disease developed years after the exposure.

How would the recordkeeping be useful? Right now the automobile industry is finding higher than usual rates of certain kinds of cancer in the craftsmen who do its wood modeling work. The agent is not yet identified, but we must assume it will be someday.

Suppose it turns out to be a substance in wide industrial use? Would it not immeasurably advance the effectiveness of occupational health and public health to know when it was used? And where it was used? And to have those who used it alerted to a potential danger? Would it not help avoid future mass confusion of the type we see today with asbestos?

Mr. Speaker, no one in any oversight hearing on labeling disputed that some of these substances are highly dangerous or that the Nation needs to establish some way of dealing with them; not one witness that we heard.

Now, one criticism of the communication standard is the number of workers it affects compared to the number of workers who use these substances.

According to the United Steelworkers of America, about 14 million workers in manufacturing would be under it while about 50 million in construction, utilities, transportation, warehousing, and agriculture would go uncovered.

Another objection is that OSHA's standard would preempt more stringent State and local regulation that began developing in the absence of Federal action. Preemption would overturn the generally accepted idea that States are free to be tougher than the Federal Government if they choose. And it would contradict the trend that OSHA has been fostering by encouraging more States to take up health and safety responsibilities.

One of the more detailed criticisms comes from Dr. Arthur Oleinick, a medical doctor and a lawyer, who is an associate professor of the University of Michigan's School of Public Health. His field is public health law.

Dr. Oleinick, the physician, questions the communication standard's claim of performance orientation.

For example—

He said—

the present proposal neither defines carcinogen nor specifies the minimum data set that will trigger a finding that a chemical poses a cancer hazard. Regardless of which hazard evaluation process the chemical manufacturer uses, the standard's objective in the area of carcinogen labeling and hazard communication remains obscure.

Dr. Oleinick, the lawyer, sees a possibly illegal redelegation by OSHA of the authority delegated to it by Congress.

The standard as proposed—

He said—

will permit the chemical manufacturers to define individually the health hazards to be covered and then to determine whether a hazard is present, using their own notion of what constitutes proof of hazard.

Dr. Oleinick's opinion is that the new communication standard will not yield uniform labeling results while the old identification standard would.

The old would impose costs of \$248 million while the new would have a price tag of \$230, he estimated, adding the new, "can hardly be justified on the grounds that it will be substantially less expensive than the more comprehensive process" first proposed.

He finds shortcomings medically and legally and in economic justification.

What is Dr. Oleinick's overall opinion?

These deficiencies are so substantial, in my mind, as to raise grave doubts as to both the potential effectiveness and the legality of the present proposal.

He commented.

Dr. Oleinick's perspective for these comments and conclusions is as the consultant who was the guiding hand in drafting the old standard. But even making a substantial allowance for that role, the questions point to the possibility of extensive and expensive litigation and to lengthy delay. Such developments would benefit no one.

The rulemaking process still is open and will be for some time, and right now there is no reason on the record to believe that Secretary Aucter will not heed those critical comments that are valid and well meant.

The subcommittee hearings show there is a universally recognized need for a standard.

They show effective labeling can be attained. We saw instances in which innovative companies established good programs that met most of the needs outlined. And they give away no trade secrets in doing it, by the way.

So to fall short of the mark toward which this first step should lead will put indelibly on record much about this administration.

Foremost, it will say whether this administration is attempting to move toward effective regulation by a new method or whether it is engaged in just another fancy fast shuffle that leads nowhere.●

PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL CENTENNIAL YEAR

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 100th anniversary of the first Needham and Wellesley High School football games. This Massachusetts high schools football rivalry rep-

resents the oldest such high school rivalry in the Nation.

On November 30, 1982, teams from Needham and Wellesley High School met at Hunnewell Park in Wellesley, starting what has now become a significant lasting Thanksgiving Day tradition. Of course, today, events like the Needham-Wellesley football game have joined the turkey dinner as an important part of our Thanksgiving Day ritual. And, since that initial encounter in 1882, generations of young people from Needham and Wellesley have squared off every Thanksgiving morning and have provided countless thrilling moments for their friends and families and for local sports fans alike.

Today, the Needham-Wellesley rivalry embodies all of the virtues of athletic competition. The contests have always been noted for their exciting and enthusiastic nature, epitomizing the type of hearty spirit that is unique to high school athletics. Second, the young athletes have consistently demonstrated a high caliber of skill and talent, the dividends of their diligence and their many long hours spent in practice. And finally, while vigorously engaging in competition and striving for victory, the participants have refused to compromise their admirable standards of sportsmanship and have—much to the communities' benefit—fostered good relations and friendship among all those involved.

We are all proud of the history and competitive spirit of this long-standing rivalry. In commemoration of the centennial anniversary of "The Nation's Oldest Public High School Football Rivalry" the year 1982 has been proclaimed "Public High School Football Centennial Year" in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by joining with the Governor and the people of Massachusetts in congratulating all of those past and present, who have taken part in this traditional rivalry and in wishing them every success in their future endeavors.●

CONTINUING STRONG FIRE PREVENTION EFFORTS

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that yesterday the House passed H.R. 6956, the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1983 which included \$6 million for the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA). The Reagan administration did not propose funding for the USFA for 1983. The Senate Appropriations Committee has reported

\$4.15 for the USFA. Both appropriations and authorizing committees have gone on record in support of continuing the USFA.

The USFA, now a part of the Federal Emergency Management Agency has provided valuable technical and education assistance to local fire departments that respond to approximately 2.7 million fires each year.

I stand with many of my colleagues in Congress, the Joint Council of Fire Services Organizations, and State and local leaders across the country, in support of continuing the USFA and carrying out the mandates of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

America's fire problem is grim—approximately 8,100 deaths, over 200,000 injuries, \$5 billion worth of property damage and \$1.23 billion in direct losses due to arson each year. The 8,100 deaths are roughly equal to having two jumbo jets crash in midair every month. Our national fire problem leaves little justification for a haphazard approach to preventing and controlling fires.

Fire prevention and control is a national problem which demands a national coordinated approach. We must support this effort to continue the USFA. ●

HUMAN DRAMA OF GUATEMALA

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the great human drama of El Salvador. Less well known, however, is what is happening today in Guatemala. There is an Iowa priest who has been serving in Guatemala for 25 years. For 25 years, he has served and watched the human rights situation there deteriorate. For 25 years, he has been concerned, but he maintained his silence, writing occasionally on what he knew, but insisting on his anonymity.

On Sunday, his silence was broken. On Sunday, the Des Moines Register carried on the front page Father Hennessey's accusations of atrocities by the Guatemalan Army. Why did he change his mind and ask his sister, a nun from Dubuque, Iowa, to release to the public the letters he has written about the conditions of Huehuetenango Province? There are two reasons that have caused him to now place his life in a position of extreme jeopardy.

First, the level and scope of the massacre in the Indian highlands have dramatically increased since the March 23, coup that brought Gen. Efraim Rios Montt to power. "Please use this and anything else I sent to get others to stop this madness," he wrote to his sister.

Second, Father Hennessey learned that the Congress had approved the Reagan administration's request to send \$11 million in economic assistance to the Montt government (in reality this figure was \$10 million—\$1 million being cut by the Appropriation Committee). He decided that if we could approve that aid, it meant that the American people and the Congress were totally unaware of the real conditions that exist within Guatemala today.

The "madness" Father Hennessey speaks of is the wholesale slaughter of Indians in the rural highlands of Guatemala. While he, like many other independent observers, always point out that the guerrilla factions do kill those individuals who refuse to cooperate with them, it is only the army and its allies which engage in the massacres and total destruction of entire Indian villages and hamlets.

Father Hennessey reported that there were 20 incidents in his parish alone during July. For instance, 300 Guatemalan soldiers heeded the people of town 13 into three buildings and told them to pray. The soldiers then set fire to the buildings and 60 families, save 3 men, perished in the flames.

That represents one incident alone. I have asked that his letter to the Des Moines Register be inserted into the RECORD.

Father Hennessey is a man caught in the middle. He wrote to his sister that "The guerrillas are not the answer." Most recently he told her that he feels compassion for the men serving in the Guatemalan Army. Remember that it is quite easy to forget that soldiers are human too. On August 11, however, after a month-long spree, reminiscent of the horrors of Auschwitz, one of those soldiers showed his appall over events within his country by trying to commit suicide in San Mateo. He was not successful, so he was severely punished.

I believe it important for us to now turn our attentions to events within Guatemala, to tell President Montt that we cannot tolerate genocide, to ask that he provide us with a response to these damning allegations and to insure that Father Hennessey will not suffer reprisals for now speaking out. Finally, I would like to humbly urge the Foreign Affairs Committee to review Father Hennessey's allegations and other reports of increased violations of basic human rights in Guatemala so that we may better review the wisdom of our decision to forward \$10 million in economic support moneys to the Montt regime. Perhaps we may not be able to put an end to the current madness and terror that grips this nation, but certainly we do not have to condone it.

PRIEST SERVING IN GUATEMALA CHARGES ATROCITIES BY ARMY: DUBUQUE NUN GETS A LETTER ABOUT KILLING

(By Kenneth Pins)

DUBUQUE, IOWA.—A Maryknoll priest and native Iowan serving in Guatemala recently released accounts of government slayings of Mayan Indians that appear to contradict the State Department version of human rights conditions in that country.

"Please use this and anything else I sent to try to get others to help stop this madness," wrote the Rev. Ron Hennessey.

The Aug. 16 letter was smuggled out of Guatemala and sent to Hennessey's sister, a Dubuque nun.

Hennessey, a native of Ryan, Ia., serves Mayans in underdeveloped Huehuetenango province in western Guatemala. He's been almost helplessly recording the destruction of his parishioners for the last few months. And he claims most of the killing has been at the hands of the Guatemalan army, which is under the control of President Efraim Rios Montt, a born-again Christian who is supported by the U.S. government.

Entire villages of innocent people have been destroyed by Rios Montt's army under the pretense of removing "subversives" who aid and abet anti-government guerrillas, Hennessey wrote.

"I see no end to this type of thing," he wrote in the letter received here Tuesday by Sister Dorothy Marie Hennessey.

Like El Salvador and Honduras, Guatemala has been enduring a persistent bloodletting between army forces and guerrillas opposing the regime. But since Rios Montt came to power in March, says U.S. Representative Tom Harkin all the Indians have been labeled subversives, and the government policy "borders on genocide."

"The guerrillas are not the answer," Hennessey wrote. They, too, have killed innocent people who refused to provide them with food, "but nothing like all the people of a village."

A team of State Department officials spent two days in Guatemala in August investigating human rights at the invitation of the Guatemalan government.

"Basically, my impression is that there has been a great change in the attitude," Undersecretary of State Melvin Levitsky said Friday. "Guatemala City is no longer a city of fear."

But in the countryside, where Levitsky said insurgents often ambush army patrols, "The picture is a mixed one and confused."

"It's a struggle for the loyalty of these [Indian] people," Levitsky said, "and many of them are caught in the middle."

Levitsky conceded that the State Department relies heavily on information from the Guatemalan government, and he said he and others involved in the August visit never got out to Huehuetenango province where much of the fighting is going on. But, Levitsky said, "the government claims it does not use indiscriminate violence."

He added: "We've been encouraged by what this new government has been doing." As a result, the United States has increased aid to Guatemala under the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

Hennessey, a missionary in Guatemala for 18 years, sees it differently.

In a letter sent out of Guatemala in late July he wrote: "On the spot I cannot tell if Rios Montt is truly a mystic elevated beyond the cruel reality . . . or if he is really a genocidist in the guise of a Christian prophet."

"Let me give you a few of the happenings of just this month in just this parish, and let you decide for yourselves." Hennessey listed 20 incidents in his parish alone during July that he knows of personally, or has been told about.

July 2—The military came to San Mateo, where Hennessey is pastor, and read a list of 40 names of people who they said would become part of the new civil defense. Ten of those people presented themselves, and were led out of the village where their hands were tied behind their backs and their throats were slashed. Their bodies were found tossed off a cliff.

July 9—Soldiers hanged Diego Mario Mateo head downward from a light pole in the town square, applied their boots to his face, shot him and let him hang there for 24 hours before throwing him into the river. Two other people, supposedly runners for the guerrillas, were taken away to entertain people of other towns in the same way.

July 12-13—In the village of Sebepe, soldiers divided the people into three groups and forced one group to kill another, and they forced a third group to kill the second. Thirty-seven people were killed in all.

July 14—The local military commander sent word for all of the people of the village of Petenac to assemble at 11 a.m. All the men were then bound and escorted to a house, where they were shot and stabbed. Their bodies were piled on top of each other and the house was set on fire.

The women of the village, some with babies on their backs, were killed and burned the same way. The children, however, were tied one to another and led into a house where they were burned alive.

July 18—Soldiers told all of the people of the village of San Francisco to assemble in the church to pray, and then set all the village buildings on fire. Sixty families died in the flames.

"There's no way you can confirm any of this," Levitsky said. "One sees burned-out villages when one flies over the country, but who burned them?"

Levitsky argued that it's possible that guerrillas posing as army members committed some of the atrocities, but Sister Dorothy Marie doesn't believe that.

"Roe's right there, he ought to know," she said.

Despite Guatemalan government claims to the contrary, Hennessey said, the army arbitrarily kills villagers thought to have dealings with the guerrillas, Guerrillas often, at gunpoint, force villages to feed them, and Hennessey said the army has made giving food to guerrillas a capital offense. Missionaries who interfere to protect

people caught in the middle are often themselves threatened or killed. Hennessey, 52, has been threatened for his intervention, which has included offering medical aid and pleading for the release of prisoners.

His sister fears of his safety but said she followed through with his request to release the letters in hopes the killing will be abated.

According to Harkin, "every credible source" has claimed that the rural killing has increased under Rios Montt. "The government has a policy of liquidating Indians," he said, "and Rios Montt has given that his tacit approval."

Hennessey has turned down three opportunities to leave Guatemala, and he was threatened with expulsion for intervening to save three lives in July.●

SOVIET VIGIL

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1982

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. LENT, in remembering the plight of those citizens in the Soviet Union seeking immigration to Israel. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. LENT for organizing and leading this year's vigil and for his many efforts on behalf of those Soviet Jews who are not allowed to immigrate to Israel.

I would now like to address the issue of the fate of a Mrs. Galda Nuhimovna Levina, a woman who has continually applied for an exit visa for the last 12 years, only to be refused after each subsequent request. The pain and disappointment this woman has experienced must be indescribable. Unfortunately though, her situation is not at all unique. Over the decades, many people have applied for visas only to be repeatedly refused, becoming virtual prisoners in a country which will not grant them their humble request.

In the specific case of Mrs. Levina, she is a 67-year-old widow who is suffering from cancer, and her prognosis for the future is dim. She survives on a minimal pension provided for her by

the government, who also prescribed for her a communal apartment which she shares with two women who are strangers to her. Mrs. Levina's only son was granted an exit visa in 1978, and although he did not wish to leave his mother, he did so at her insistence. Since that time, he has married and is now living in my district in Massachusetts.

At this point in her life, it would seem normal for Mrs. Levina to be enjoying the fruits of her many years of labor in a missile factory, but due to her alleged knowledge of state secrets learned during her employment, she has lived in a state of limbo, waiting for her freedom to be granted, away from her only child and suffering from a debilitating disease. It is my belief that this is a horrendous way for any elderly person to be spending the final years of his or her life.

We in these United States are extremely fortunate to have the religious and personal freedoms that our forefathers made such an integral and crucial part of our Constitution. We are one of the few nations on this Earth whose citizens are guaranteed the right of self-determination, which I fear we all too often take for granted. Refuseniks of the Soviet Union, such as Galda Levina, do not know what this rare ability is like, but they do know that it is something for which they will fight with every ounce of strength they possess.

This dream of freedom which is held by all the Soviet Jewry is that which has led them this far in their quest for emigration rights to Israel. We are keeping this vigil in the United States in remembrance of their courage and fortitude against a government that holds them captive, though they have committed no grievous act. It is my fervent hope for the future that these people we are supporting and praising today will soon know that security we have as free citizens. And perhaps one day soon, all those who have so valiantly sought freedom and have finally attained it may be seen standing on the shores of a new land, with dreams of a new future before them.●